CONSERVANDO CRESCE

# ORIGINES ECCLESIASTICÆ;

OR, THE

# ANTIQUITIES

OF

# THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH,

AND

## OTHER WORKS,

OF THE


## REV. JOSEPH BINGHAM, M.A.

FORMERLY FELLOW OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD;
AND AFTERWARDS RECTOR OF HEADBOURN WORTHY, AND HAVANT, HAMPSHIRE.


---

WITH THE QUOTATIONS AT LENGTH, IN THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGES, AND A BIOGRAPHICAL ACCOUNT OF THE AUTHOR.

---

IN NINE VOLUMES.

VOL. VIII.

---


LONDON:

PRINTED FOR WILLIAM STRAKER,
443, WEST STRAND;
& J. H. PARKER, OXFORD.

1840.


Digitized by Google

# ORIGINES ECCLESIASTICÆ;

OR, THE

# ANTIQUITIES

OF

# THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH,

AND

## OTHER WORKS,

OF THE


## REV. JOSEPH BINGHAM, M.A.

FORMERLY FELLOW OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD;
AND AFTERWARDS RECTOR OF HEADBOURN WORTHY, AND HAVANT, HAMPSHIRE.


---

WITH THE QUOTATIONS AT LENGTH, IN THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGES, AND A BIOGRAPHICAL ACCOUNT OF THE AUTHOR.

---

IN NINE VOLUMES.

VOL. VIII.

---


LONDON:

PRINTED FOR WILLIAM STRAKER,
443, WEST STRAND;
& J. H. PARKER, OXFORD.

1840.


Digitized by Google

TO

HIS MOST SACRED MAJESTY,

GEORGE,

BY THE GRACE OF GOD

KING OF GREAT BRITAIN, FRANCE, AND IRELAND,
DEFENDER OF THE FAITH, &c.

---

MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN,

I HUMBLY beg leave to lay at your Majesty's feet a part of a larger work, which was at first designed to promote those great and worthy ends, which your Majesty in your princely wisdom by your royal declarations has lately thought fit to recommend to your Universities and Clergy: that is, the promotion of Christian piety and knowledge, and such useful learning, as may instil good principles into the minds of younger students; upon which the prosperity of Church and State will in this and all succeeding ages so much depend. The practice of the primitive ages of the Church, when reduced into one view, seems to be one of the most proper means to effect these honourable designs; and with that consideration I have hitherto proceeded in this laborious work, not without the countenance and approbation of many worthy men, and now hope to finish it under your Majesty's favour and protection: humbly beseeching Almighty God to bless your Majesty's great designs for the good of this Church and Nation, and the Protestant interest abroad: which is, and ever shall be, the hearty prayer of

Your Majesty's

most loyal and obedient servant,

JOSEPH BINGHAM.

Digitized by Google

# WORKS

OF

# THE REV. JOSEPH BINGHAM, M.A.

---

## VOLUME VIII.

CONTAINING

A SCHOLASTICAL HISTORY OF LAY-BAPTISM;

TWO SERMONS, AND TWO LETTERS TO THE LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER, CONCERNING ABSOLUTION;

A DISSERTATION UPON THE EIGHTH CANON OF THE COUNCIL OF NICE;

AND

A DISCOURSE ON THE MERCY OF GOD.



Digitized by Google

LONDON:

PRINTED BY MOYES AND BARCLAY, CASTLE STREET,

LEICESTER SQUARE.

Digitized by Google

# CONTENTS

OF

# THE EIGHTH VOLUME.

---

## SCHOLASTICAL HISTORY OF LAY-BAPTISM.

## PART I.

PREFACE, 3.

### CHAPTER I.

*An Account of the Practice of the Ancient Church.*

SECT. I. The State of the Controversy about Lay-Baptism, 13.—II. The Commission given to the Apostles to Baptize, by them communicated to others at Discretion, 14.—III. Bishops invested with the same Power which the Apostles had, as their Successors, 16.—IV. By what Power Presbyters anciently Baptized, in ordinary or extraordinary Cases, 20.—V. Of the Power granted anciently to Deacons to Baptize, 22.—VI. Whether the inferior Clergy were allowed to Baptize? 30.—VII. Laymen prohibited to Baptize in ordinary Cases, 32.—VIII. Yet allowed to do it sometimes in Cases extraordinary, 33.—IX. The Testimony of the Council of Eliberis, 34.—X. Of the Church of Alexandria, 36.—XI. Of St. Jerome, 39.—XII. Of St. Austin, 40.—XIII. Of Gelasius (an. 492), 42.—XIV. Of Isidore, Bishop of Seville (an. 595), 42.—XV. The Objection from St. Chrysostom, Basil, and Cyprian, answered, 43.—XVI. Whether the usurped and unauthorized Baptism of Laymen was allowed to be valid, 46.—XVII. Of the Baptism of Women, whether they had any Authority to Baptize, 49.—XVIII. Whether the usurped Baptism of Women was esteemed valid? 52.—XIX. Whether Heretical and Schismatical Priests, and Degraded Clergymen, had any legal Authority to Baptize? 52.—XX. Whether the Baptism of Heretics and Schismatics was valid? 56.—XXI. What Defects there are in the Baptism of Heretics and Schismatics, and how those Defects are supplied, 75.—XXII. Whether the Baptism of Heretics and Schismatics be any more than the Baptism of unauthorized Laymen? 83.—XXIII. How the Church of England comes to have Authority to Baptize, though she had her Baptism only from the Heretical Church of Rome? 87.—XXIV. Of the Baptism of Turks, Jews, and Infidels, 92.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER II.

*The Practice of the Modern Greeks and Moscovites.*

SECT. I. The Practice of the Modern Greek Church, 94.—II. The Practice of the Moscovites, 101.

CHAPTER III.

*The Practice of the Churches of the Reformation.*

SECT. I. The Practice of the Lutherans, 102.—II. Of the Helvetic Churches, 106.—III. Of the Calvinists, and French and Dutch Churches, 107.—IV. Of the Palatine Churches, 110.—V. The Practice of the Church of England, 112.

APPENDIX,

CONTAINING SOME REMARKS ON THE HISTORICAL PART OF MR. LAWRENCE'S WRITINGS, TOUCHING THE INVALIDITY OF LAY-BAPTISM; HIS PRELIMINARY DISCOURSE ON THE VARIOUS OPINIONS OF THE FATHERS CONCERNING REBAPTIZATION AND INVALID BAPTISMS; AND HIS DISCOURSE OF SACERDOTAL POWERS.—125.

PART II.

THE AUTHOR'S DEDICATION, 145.

THE STATE OF THE PRESENT CONTROVERSY.

SECT. I. No further Dispute with Dr. Brett about the Modern Greek Church, 159.—II. Nor about the Churches of the Reformation, 160.—III. How far we are agreed about the Church of England, 160.—IV. How far we are agreed about the Primitive Writers, 162.—V. Whether St. Basil and the Council of Trullo determine the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, in the Practice of the Church? 164.—VI. An Account of the Luciferian Heresy. And whether St. Jerome be a Witness of the Church's annulling the Baptism of Laymen in ordinary Cases? 170.—VII. The Testimony of Chrysostom no Evidence against the Baptism of Laymen in extraordinary Cases, 194.

CHAPTER I.

*That Heretics, and Schismatics, and Degraded Clerks, and Excommunicated Clerks, when once they are convicted, and legally censured, are no longer authorized to minister Baptism, or officiate as true Priests and Ministers of God and the Church; but that henceforth all their Acts are unauthorized, and done only by Usurpation.—This proved from the History of the Six First General Councils, and their Proceedings against Heretics, and Schismatics, and other Delinquents.*

SECT. I. How Meletius was deposed and divested of all Ministerial Authority, by the Council of Nice, 199.—II. How Arius was deposed and anathematized by

Digitized by Google

the same Council, 202.—III. How the Macedonians, Apollinarians, and other Heretics, were degraded and anathematized in the Second General Council of Constantinople, 205.—IV. How the Third General Council of Ephesus degraded Nestorius and his Followers, 209.—V. How the Council of Chalcedon deposed Eutyches and Dioscorus, and their Adherents, 215.—VI. Of the Condemnation of Anthimus and Severus in the Council of Constantinople, under Mennas (an. 536), 221.—VII. How the Defenders of the *Tria Capitula* were degraded in the Fifth General Council of Constantinople, 223.—VIII. How the Sixth General Council of Constantinople deposed and anathematized the Monothelites, 224.—IX. How the Council of Trullo censured delinquent Bishops and Clerks, 228.

## CHAPTER II.

*The same Assertion proved from Patriarchal, National, and Provincial Councils; and from the Writings of Private Fathers, with several Arguments drawn from their Testimony. Argument I.—That some Heretics, whose Baptism was received, never had originally any real and true Ordination to the Ministerial Office and Function: consequently they could be no other than Unauthorized Persons. This particularly proved upon the Novatian Heresy.*

Sect. I. A short Reference to such Patriarchal, National, and Provincial Councils, as agree with the forementioned General Councils, 231.—II. The first Argument founded upon the Novatians wanting a true Ordination, 233.—III. That Novatian was never a true Bishop; proved, first, because he had only a simoniacal and forced Ordination, 234.—IV. This proved further, because he intruded himself into a full See, 236.

## CHAPTER III.

*Argument II.—That Heretics are not Authorized Ministers of God: because, when they fall into open and professed Heresy, they cease to be true Christian Priests, and become Wolves and Antichrists, instead of true Shepherds and Governors of the Flock of Christ.*

Sect. I. That a lawful Ordination does not secure a Man in the Possession of a perpetual Authorized Priesthood, unless he observe the Rules of the Priesthood, 243.—II. This proved from Cyprian, who declares Heretics to forfeit both the Name and Authority of Priests, 244.—III. From the Council of Aquileia, under St. Ambrose (an. 381), 246.—IV. From the Council of Colonia Agrippina (an. 346), 247.—V. From an Italic Council, under St. Ambrose (an. 381), 248.—VI. From the Roman Council of ninety Bishops under Damasus (an. 369), 249.—VII. From the Testimony of Domnus, Bishop of Antioch, and John Cassian, 249.—VIII. And Pope Innocent, 250.—IX. And Pope Simplicius, 251.—X. And Pope Vigilius, 252.

## CHAPTER IV.

*Argument III.—That Heretics and Degraded Clerks were not Authorized Priests in the Account of the Ancient Church, because, by her Discipline, they were reduced to the State and Communion of Laymen.*

Sect. I. No Persons, who were obliged to do Public Penance, allowed to be of the Clergy, 253.—II. All Degraded Persons reduced, at least, to Lay-Com-

Digitized by Google

munion, 254. — III. This proved from Cyprian and his Contemporaries, Cornelius and the Council of Carthage, 255. — IV. And from the Apostolical Canons, 258. — V. And the Council of Eliberis, 259. — VI. And the Council of Sardica, 259. — VII. And the Council of Agde, 260. — VIII. And the Council of Orleans, 260. — IX. The First Council of Toledo, 260. — X. The Council of Hippo and St. Austin, 261. — XI. The Decrees of Pope Innocent, 263. — XII. And Siricius, 263. — XIII. And St. Basil, 263. — XIV. And the Council of Trullo, 263.

## CHAPTER V.

*Argument IV. — That Heretics, and Schismatics, and Degraded Clerks, were not accounted Authorized Priests, because they were sometimes thrust one Degree below Laymen, by being Anathematized and cast out of the Communion of the Church.*

Sect. I. That no Man is reckoned a complete Layman, but he that is in full Communion with the Church, 265. — II. Heretics and Schismatics, and Degraded Clerks, sometimes denied also the Privilege of Lay-Communion, 267. — III. This proved from the Testimony of Cyprian, 267. — IV. And the Apostolical Canons, 268. — V. The Council of Cologne, 268. — VI. The Council of Sardica, 269. — VII. The Council of Eliberis, 269. — VIII. The Council of Rome, under Felix III. (an. 487), 270.

## CHAPTER VI.

*The Objection taken from the Notion of an Indelible Character imprinted in the Ordination of a Priest examined, and shewed to be of no Force against the former Allegations. With an Account of the first Original and Meaning of that Term in the Writings of the Church.*

Sect. I. What meant by an 'Indelible Character' imprinted in Baptism, 271. — II. That the 'Indelible Character' of Ordination is of the same Nature, 275. — III. The Name of 'Indelible Character' not to be found in any Ancient Council, 277. — IV. In what Sense St. Austin owns and allows it in Heretical Priests, 278. — V. What the Papists mean by their 'Indelible Character,' 280. — VI. How far an 'Indelible Character' is allowed by Protestant Writers, 282. — VII. What Submission is due to the Judgment of the Catholic Church, in such Points of Discipline as Rebaptizing and Reordaining, 287.

## CHAPTER VII.

*A Resolution of some Difficulties concerning the Communion of Heretics, and their Baptisms and Ordinations.*

Sect. I. Whether it be lawful to hold Communion with Heretical Priests before they be degraded? 288. — II. Whether it be lawful to communicate with Heretics, when a whole Church is heretical? 292. — III. Whether, in any Case, it be lawful to desire the Baptism of Heretics? 294. — IV. Whether the Ordinations of Heretics and Schismatics may be accepted by the Church without Reordaining? 297.

Digitized by Google

# APPENDIX,

## CONTAINING SOME REMARKS ON THE AUTHOR OF "THE SECOND PART OF LAY-BAPTISM INVALID."

### CHAPTER I.

*A short Way to end the Controversy with this Author about Unauthorized Baptism, by shewing his great Ignorance of the Ancient Discipline of the Church, whilst he supposes the Ancient Heretics to be true Authorized Priests in actual Commission, when the Church had reduced them to the State of Laymen.*—303.

### CHAPTER II.

*Containing Remarks on our Author's Preface.*

SECT. I. The Unauthorized Baptisms and Invalid Baptisms are not of the same Import in the Sense of the Ancient Church, 321.—II. This Author's Reasons for the Validity of Heretical Baptism very different from those of the Primitive Church, 322.—III. This Author's Notion about the Invalidity of Heretical Baptism unbaptizes the whole Church of England, 323.—IV. The Exceptions of our Author against the new Form of Confirmation, which was proposed to the Convocation, considered, 324.—V. Our Author confesses his Mistake in producing Lucifer as a Witness against Lay-Baptism, 326.—VI. How our Author confounds Valid Baptism and Saving Baptism together, 326.—VII. That Heretical Baptism is properly Anti-episcopal, by our Author's own Concessions, 328.—VIII. That our Author's Charge upon his Adversaries, of dissolving the Necessity of the Christian Priesthood, equally reflects upon the Principles and Practice of the whole Catholic Church in all Ages, 331.

### CHAPTER III.

*Remarks on our Author's First and Second Chapters.*

SECT. I. That the allowing the Baptisms of Usurpers to be valid, is not abetting or encouraging their Usurpations, 334.—II. That some Discretionary Power was supposed to be in the Hands of Bishops in commissioning Persons to Baptize, 338.—III. Whether Deacons were accounted Priests, and the Ordinary and Standing Ministers of Baptism? 339.—IV. That many Uncommissioned Baptisms were anciently confirmed by Bishops without Rebaptizing, 341.—V. The necessary Distinction of the Ancients between an Authoritative and a merely Valid Baptism confounded by our Author, 343.

### CHAPTER IV.

*Of the Greek Church, and the Churches of the Reformation.*

SECT. I. That the Ancient Greek Church had several Laws before the Eighth Century, determining the Validity of Uncommissioned Lay-Baptism, 346.—II. The Authority of the Canons of Nicephorus vindicated from our Author's Exceptions, 347.—III. Our Author's disingenuous Way of answering the Modern Greek Writers, 350.—IV. That the Reason of the Greeks' Practice

Digitized by Google

was not their Opinion of the Absolute Necessity of Baptism for dying Infants, 354.—V. Of the Moscovite, or Russian Churches, 356.—VI. No further Dispute about the Lutheran Churches, 357.—VII. Nor about Zuinglius and the Helvetic Churches, 357.—VIII. That the Calvinists do, in some Cases, own the Validity of Lay-Baptism, 358.

TWO SERMONS, AND TWO LETTERS TO THE LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER, CONCERNING THE NATURE AND NECESSITY OF THE SEVERAL SORTS OF ABSOLUTION, SHEWING HOW FAR THAT NECESSITY EXTENDS, AND WHERE IT CEASES.

SERMON I.

*Whosesoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever Sins ye retain, they are retained* (John, xx. 23). —365.

SERMON II.

*Whosesoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever Sins ye retain, they are retained* (John, xx. 23). —380.

*A Letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Winchester, concerning the Necessity of Absolution.*—398.

*A Second Letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Winchester, concerning the Necessity of Absolution.*—406.

A DISSERTATION UPON THE EIGHTH CANON OF THE COUNCIL OF NICE: PROVING THAT NOVATIAN, THE HERETIC, WAS NEVER ALLOWED TO BE A TRUE BISHOP IN ANY PART OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH: WITH SOME REMARKS ON MR. LAWRENCE'S WAY OF HANDLING THE CONTROVERSY ABOUT LAY-BAPTISM.—417.

A DISCOURSE CONCERNING THE MERCY OF GOD TO PENITENT SINNERS; INTENDED FOR THE USE OF PERSONS TROUBLED IN MIND.

*As a Father pitieth his Children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him.*—(Psalm ciii. 113).—463.

Digitized by Google

A

# SCHOLASTICAL HISTORY

OF THE

# PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH

IN REFERENCE TO THE

# ADMINISTRATION OF BAPTISM BY LAYMEN.

WHEREIN AN ACCOUNT IS GIVEN OF
THE PRACTICE OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH,
THE PRACTICE OF THE MODERN GREEK CHURCH,
AND THE PRACTICE OF THE CHURCHES OF THE REFORMATION.

WITH AN

## APPENDIX,

CONTAINING SOME REMARKS ON THE HISTORICAL PART OF MR. LAWRENCE'S WRITINGS, TOUCHING THE INVALIDITY OF LAY-BAPTISM; HIS PRELIMINARY DISCOURSE OF THE VARIOUS OPINIONS OF THE FATHERS CONCERNING REBAPTIZATION AND INVALID BAPTISMS; AND HIS DISCOURSE OF SACERDOTAL POWERS.



Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

# THE PREFACE.

THE first design of the following discourse was only to have been a single chapter of the next volume of my *Origines Ecclesiasticæ;* where the order I have proposed to observe in that work, will lead me next to pursue the several offices of the ancient liturgy and services of the Church; and among them, in the first place, the institution of the catechumens, together with the offices of baptism and confirmation. Here the subject-matter would necessarily lead me to speak of the minister of baptism, and of rebaptizations, and the power granted to laymen, in some certain cases, to baptize. But I quickly found, that to do justice to the present subject, especially at a time when some controversies had been raised about it, it would be requisite to handle it a little more largely than would consist with the usual method I have observed in my *Origines,* where great variety of matter obliges me to treat upon all subjects as compendiously and succinctly as possible: and therefore I have chosen to treat of this one particular

Digitized by Google

subject in a separate discourse by itself, that I might have room to enlarge upon it, and give such a historical account as was proper upon the present occasion. I had observed several mistakes to be committed, in relation to this matter, by some late learned writers: and though I love not to enter into dispute with any men, yet it was necessary for me, in this discourse, with due respect and civility, to take notice of them: in which case, I think no great names so venerable, as to be of sufficient authority to lead others by their dictates only, especially in matters of fact and history, unless they assign just grounds and reasons for their assertions. Upon this account, I have taken the liberty to shew the mistakes of the learned Dr. Forbes, in reference to the baptisms of deacons and laymen; and how he wrong understands the meaning of St. Chrysostom and St. Jerome upon those subjects. And because, in the point of rebaptization, Stephen, bishop of Rome, has been much misrepresented, as if he were for receiving the baptism of all heretics in general, without exception, I could not but do justice to his character, in that respect, by setting matters in their proper light, though several great names, and Bishop Pearson's among the rest, had given current credit and authority to the contrary opinion. I had observed, also, great stress laid upon the sense of the modern Greek Church, and the practice of the Churches of the Reformation, by some late learned writers, in reference to the point of laymen's baptizing in cases of necessity, or otherwise, to prove the invalidity of all such baptisms: and, therefore, I have made

Digitized by Google

a particular inquiry into the judgment and practice of all those Churches, and corrected several plain mistakes committed in the accounts that have been been given of them, by those that have pleaded their authority in this behalf. I have, also, made a particular inquiry into the sense and practice of the Church of England, from the beginning of the Reformation to this present time; and shewed that she has no rule, nor was ever understood to have any, for rebaptizing those who, in time of necessity, were baptized by laymen. And, because the baptism of heretics, and schismatics, and excommunicate and degraded clerks, is a matter of great concern, with which the Church universal has always been exercised; and the Church of England, in particular, has a considerable interest depending upon the validity of it,—I have been at some pains to inquire into the bottom of this question, and state it, with exactness, from the ancient writers, shewing that such baptism, though given in contradiction to authority, is notwithstanding reputed valid; and though it has its deficiencies, yet they are such as might be supplied by the Church without rebaptization. And, because it seems a great difficulty to account for the legal authority of the Church of England to baptize, whilst it is confessed that she had her baptism from the heretical and schismatical Church of Rome, I have pointed out the true method of solving this difficulty, by shewing that she regained her just authority, by returning to the unity of the holy Catholic Church at her Reformation. And that no one might object, that there were then no visible professors in the holy

Digitized by Google

Catholic Church, beside those of the Church of Rome, I have shewed that there was a very great and numerous body of such professors always preserved among the Albigenses or Waldenses, to the very time of the Reformation: and I have vindicated their character, as I thought myself in justice bound to do, from the misrepresentations and odious reflections which some among ourselves have unwarily, if not designedly, cast upon them. Finally, because the writings of Mr. Lawrence, an ingenious layman (who, out of a scruple of conscience, desired to be rebaptized), have made great impressions upon many, who reckon the acuteness of his reasonings, and the exactness of his historical accounts, unanswerable, I have made such remarks upon them as came properly in my way, to shew both him and the world that he has committed several great mistakes in point of ancient history: that he also frequently confounds the terms of lay-baptism, unauthorized baptism, and invalid baptism, together; which yet, in the history of the Church, are terms of very different importance: and that he builds his whole book upon this mistaken foundation, supposing those terms to be equivalent, which are vastly wide of one another. But that which I have chiefly remarked in Mr. Lawrence's way of handling this argument is, the fatal tendency of the notions he has advanced concerning the invalidity of heretical and schismatical baptism, which, in their direct and immediate consequence, do unchurch and unbaptize the whole Church of England, unless it can be shewed that we had our baptism from some other Church originally than from

Digitized by Google

the heretical and schismatical Church of Rome. This is a consideration so momentous, that I hope neither Mr. Lawrence, nor any other who indiscriminately imbibe his notions, will be displeased at me for observing it, since so much of our Christianity depends upon it in these latter ages of the Church. But if any obloquy or reproach befals me for saying this, I can easily be content to receive and suffer it for the good of the Church universal and the Church of England, whose true interests I have always been serving, by writing the Antiquities of the one, and apologies for the other; in pursuance of both which designs, I have published the present discourse, not only to give an account of the practice of the ancient Church, but to vindicate the just right and power of the Church of England, when, under pretence of magnifying her power, such arguments and methods of reasoning are used, as tend to overthrow her constitution, and leave her naked, exposed, and destitute even of true Christian baptism: which has been the misfortune of Mr. Lawrence's way of reasoning, if I am capable of understanding him. I can readily acknowledge my great respects for Mr. Lawrence, as a man of a sharp wit, and, in many things, an acute reasoner: and I can as heartily pity any man in his circumstances, who, out of a pure scruple of conscience, doubting the validity of his baptism, desires leave of the Church to be rebaptized, for satisfaction. For, in some cases (though not exactly in his) where a man doubted whether he were baptized or not, the Primitive Church allowed of a rebaptization, to take away all scruples that might arise upon that account.

Digitized by Google

But when a man uses such arguments in his own defence, as destroy the very power of baptizing in that Church, from whom he desires to receive baptism; then it would be uncharitable to him, and unjust to the Church, not to shew him his errors, and vindicate the validity of such baptisms in the Church, as his arguments tend to overthrow. And with this view only I have made remarks upon him, as it became one to do, to whose province it is fallen to explain the laws and practices of the ancient Church, and assert the just rights and privileges of the Church of England.

There is one thing more I would humbly beg leave to offer, with all due respect to the consideration of our superiors, legally assembled in convocation; that is, whether it might not be proper to have a peculiar form of confirmation, or imposition of hands, for such as were baptized by heretics and schismatics, upon their return to the unity of the Church; considering what frequent occasion there is for such a form, by reason of great multitudes that have been baptized in heresy or schism, and are admitted into the Church upon repentance and renunciation of their errors without rebaptization. The ancient Church had such forms peculiar to this occasion: for they did not think confirmation was to be given exactly in the same way to those who were baptized by heretics or schismatics, as they did to those that were baptized in the Church; because though they did not esteem the baptism of such to be simply null and invalid, yet they looked upon it as deficient in several respects (of

Digitized by Google

which I have given a particular account in the following discourse); and therefore they appointed proper forms for the confirmation of such, before they admitted them to the eucharist, upon their return to the Church. One of these forms, because it will give some light in this matter, and illustrate what I am discoursing of, I shall here subjoin, out of De Marca, who says * he had it from a manuscript collection of an ancient writer in the French king's library, written above eight hundred years ago. And it plainly appears to be drawn in conformity to the decrees of the second general Council of Constantinople, and the Council of Trullo, which order some heretics to be received as mere heathens, by a new baptism, and others only by imposition of hands, with the unction of chrism or confirmation. The ceremony of receiving those of the latter kind is thus described: first, they are to learn the orthodox faith, and give themselves to fasting and prayer for ten or fifteen days together, being instructed and disciplined after the manner of the catechumens. Then they are publicly to renounce and anathematize their former heresies, and make profession of the Catholic faith. After which profession, kneeling down before the priest, he lays his hands upon them and recites this prayer: "O God our Saviour, who wouldst have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth; receive this thy servant, who is scarce yet throughly awakened out of error, but desirous to come to

* De Marca Notæ ad Concilium Claromontanum, p. 323.

Digitized by Google

the knowledge of thy truth. For thou hast said, 'I have other sheep which are not of this fold, and them I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd.' Feed him with the doctrine of thy truth, as thou hast revealed it by thy holy and glorious apostles; vouchsafe to give him the seal of the Divine unction, and the inspiration of thy Holy Spirit, and make him partaker of the blessed body and blood of Christ: and consummate this thy servant, that he may be numbered with thy flock, to the glory and praise of thy greatness, for thine is the kingdom and the power."

Then anointing him with the chrism, after the manner of those that are newly baptized, he uses the same form of words as is used to them: and afterward repeats this prayer: "O Lord our God, who hast vouchsafed to perfect and consummate this thy servant with the true faith in thee, and with the seal of thy holy unction: Thou Lord of all things, keep and preserve this true faith in him, make him to increase in righteousness, and adorn him with all the graces of thy Spirit." After this he is admitted to partake of the holy eucharist.

It is easy to observe, that this form of confirmation was not for such as were baptized in the Church, but peculiar to those who were baptized in heresy or schism: for mention is made of their errors in the words of the prayers; and they are obliged also to confess and anathematize their heresies upon their return to the Church. Since, therefore, we have no such peculiar form in our liturgy, I

Digitized by Google

leave it to the wisdom and discretion of our superiors to consider, whether such a form might not be proper to be added to it, when the form of reconciling penitents, and others of the like nature, come next under their consideration. This was the way which the ancient Church took to supply the deficiencies of such baptisms, as she thought fit to receive as valid, though not every way perfect, without rebaptization.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

A

# SCHOLASTICAL HISTORY,

*&c. &c.*

## PART I.

---

### CHAPTER I.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE PRACTICE OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

SECT. I. — *The State of the Controversy about Lay-Baptism.*

To understand the state of the present controversy aright, it will be necessary, in the entrance of this discourse, to distinguish these several questions from one another: — 1. Whether the commission to baptize was so given to the apostles, as that they might communicate it to any others? 2. Whether bishops were invested with the same right which the apostles had? 3. Whether the bishops may communicate this power only to presbyters or priests, as invested with sacerdotal powers? 4. Whether deacons may baptize either in ordinary or extraordinary cases? 5. Whether the minor clergy, below deacons, may have any thing of the same power communicated to them? 6. Whether mere laymen, who were never called to any ecclesiastical office, may promiscuously administer baptism in ordinary cases? 7. Whether bishops may give them a right to do it in extraordinary cases of extreme necessity? 8. Whether, if they do it with or without such commission, their baptism be wholly null and invalid? 9. Whether women may be

Digitized by Google

allowed to baptize in cases of the like necessity, and their baptism be valid? 10. Whether heretical and schismatical priests be any better qualified to administer baptism than Catholic laymen? 11. Whether their baptism be either legal or valid? 12. Lastly, Whether baptism administered by Turks, Jews, or infidels, be of any account in the Christian Church? The distinct consideration of these several questions will take in every thing that relates to this subject: and what I propose is, to give some resolution of them, so far as may be collected from the general sense and practice of the Church, both ancient and modern; beginning first with the practice of the ancient Church, then examining the rules of the modern Greek Church, and, last of all, the Churches of the Reformation.

## SECT. II. — *The Commission given to the Apostles to Baptize, by them communicated to others at Discretion.*

To begin with the practice of the ancient Church. It is certain, the commission to baptize was originally given by our Saviour to the eleven apostles: for so it is expressly said (Matth. xxviii. 16, &c.): "Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, 'All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth: go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.'" Now by the tenour of this commission it is certain, they were invested with authority not only to baptize themselves, but to communicate this power to others: for the commission and power of baptizing was not to die with them, but to continue to the end of the world. But then two questions arise from hence: Whom they actually authorized to baptize? and, To whom they gave commission to authorize others to baptize? For both these things were necessary to preserve the Church, according to the order of Christ, at least in future ages. As to the first question, it is evident, from the apostolical history, that

Digitized by Google

they gave commission to bishops, presbyters, and deacons, to baptize: for Philip, who was but a deacon, baptized the eunuch, as we read, Acts, viii. 38. But still it remains a question, whether they extended this commission to any others, either in ordinary or extraordinary cases. The ancient author, under the name of St. Ambrose, was of opinion,[a] that the apostles first found it necessary, for the augmentation and increase of the Church, to grant a general commission to all Christians, both to teach and baptize: but as soon as that necessity was over, as soon as the world was generally converted, and churches erected, governors and other officers were appointed in all churches, and then this general commission was withdrawn; so that none, even among the clergy, was to presume to meddle with any office to which he was not appointed. Hence it came to pass, that neither deacons were allowed to preach, nor the inferior clergy, nor laymen, to baptize. This author seems to have been of opinion, that the commission which our Saviour left with his apostles, was a discretionary power to authorize such others to baptize, as they in their wisdom, under the direction of the Holy Ghost, should think proper to answer the present necessities and emergent occasions of the Church: and that, therefore, as no one can have a power of baptizing but he that receives, some way or other, a commission from them; so, when the necessities of the Church required it, they had power to authorize others, besides the standing ministers, to baptize; which power they both might and did recall again, as soon as those necessities of the Church were over. And upon this principle it was, chiefly, that the ancient bishops of the Church allowed deacons, and sometimes laymen, in extraordinary cases, to baptize: for they looked upon themselves as invested with the same commission and power that the apostles had, as

[a] Ambros. Comment. in Ephes. iv. p. 948. Ut cresceret plebs et multiplicaretur, omnibus inter initia concessum est et evangelizare, et baptizare, et Scripturas in ecclesia explanare. Ubi autem omnia loca circumamplexa est ecclesia, conventicula constituta sunt, et rectores et cetera officia in ecclesiis sunt ordinata, ut nullus de clero auderet qui ordinatus non esset, præsumere officium quod sciret non sibi creditum vel concessum. Hinc ergo est, unde nunc neque diaconi in populis prædicant, neque clerici vel laici baptizant.

Digitized by Google

their successors: that is, as has been said, not only a power to baptize themselves, but to authorize others to baptize, either in ordinary or extraordinary cases. By virtue of which they made presbyters their assistants in ordinary cases, and used their discretionary power sometimes to grant authority also to deacons to minister baptism in ordinary cases, and sometimes to restrain them wholly from it, and confine them only to extraordinary cases, and great necessities of the Church, allowing them no other power than what, in the like cases, they allowed to laymen. For though no other writer among the ancients has so plainly expressed his mind upon this point as this author, under the name of St. Ambrose; yet it is plain all of them, who maintained the power of bishops to authorize deacons and laymen to baptize, or, at their discretion, to restrain them from it, must needs go upon the same principle, viz. that such a power was lodged in the hands of the bishops of the Church, as the apostles' successors, to authorize what men should baptize, and in what cases, according as they should think necessary in their wisdom and discretion, for the greater or lesser exigencies of the Church: for without this principle it will be impossible to account for the practice of the ancient bishops, who sometimes restrained deacons from baptizing, as well as laymen, and sometimes granted authority to them both.

### SECT. III.—*Bishops invested with the same Power which the Apostles had, as their Successors.*

That thus the matter was in fact, is very evident from many passages of the ancient writers, where they speak of the original power of administering baptism, as lodged solely and entirely in the hands of the bishops, as the apostles' immediate successors, and derivatively conveyed from them to others, whom they authorized to be either the standing and ordinary ministers of baptism, or else only the occasional and extraordinary ministers of it in times of absolute necessity, and great exigencies of the Church. Hence it was, that anciently, in many small diocesses, bishops were the usual and ordinary ministers of baptism themselves.

Digitized by Google

There was but one baptistery belonging to a city or a diocess, and that at the cathedral or mother church, where the bishop resided; and whither all persons came at the two solemn festivals, Easter and Pentecost, for baptism. In larger cities and diocesses, where more baptisteries were necessary, they were still erected by the bishop's appointment; and only such persons allowed to officiate in them as had his consent and authority, that nothing might be done in opposition or contradiction to him, but in a due subordination to him as their superior. Thus it is remarked by the author of the Pontifical, in the Life of Marcellus,[b] that whilst he was bishop of Rome, he appointed five and twenty churches, as so many little diocesses, for the convenience of baptizing pagans upon their conversion, and an equal number of presbyters to minister in them. But still all these were subordinate to that one bishop, and acted by the authority and commission which they received from him: so that, as one of the Roman Councils expresses it,[c] "Though both presbyters and deacons, at some solemn times, were allowed to baptize at Rome in the bishop's presence, yet they were but officials to him; and what they did was reckoned his act, and went in his name." It is peculiarly remarked to this purpose by one of the bishops present at the Council of Carthage, under Cyprian,[d] "That Christ gave the commission to his apostles, and to them alone the power which was given him by his Father; and that bishops were the apostles' successors, in governing the Church with the same power, and granting baptism to believers." Hence it became a general and a standing rule in the Church, that presbyters

[b] Pontific. Vit. Marcelli apud Crabb, tom. i. p. 204. Hic viginti titulos in urbe Roma constituit, quasi diœceses, propter baptisma et pœnitentiam multorum qui convertebantur ex paganis, et propter sepulturas martyrum.

[c] Conc. Rom. c. vii. apud Coteler. Not. in Constitut. Apost. lib. iii. c. ix. Paschæ tempore, presbyter et diaconus per parochias dare remissionem peccatorum et ministerium implere consueverunt, etiam præsente episcopo: in fontem quoque ipsi descendunt; illi in officio sunt: sed illius nomini facti summa conceditur.

[d] Conc. Carth. apud Cyprian. n. lxxix. p. 241. Manifesta est sententia Domini nostri Jesu Christi, apostolos suos mittentis, et ipsis solis potestatem a Patre sibi datam permittentis, quibus nos successimus, eadem potestate ecclesiam Domini gubernantes, et credentium fidem baptizantes.



Digitized by Google

and deacons were to perform no offices without the authority and consent of their bishop,[e] because the Lord's people were committed to his trust, and he was to answer for their souls. This was particularly specified in the office of baptism, by most of the ancient writers. This rule was as old as Ignatius, who delivers himself after this manner, in relation to this point:[f] "It is not lawful either to baptize or celebrate the eucharist without the bishop; but that which he allows, is well pleasing to God." He does not say, that no one beside the bishop might administer baptism; but that it was not regularly done without his commission or delegation: he being the chief minister of baptism, as well as all other offices in the Church. In like manner, Tertullian asserts the bishop's original right, as chief priest,[g] independent of any other; and then the right of presbyters and deacons to baptize; but this in dependence of their bishop: for they are not to do it without his authority, for the honour of the Church, in the preservation of which peace is preserved.—St. Cyprian[h] and another bishop, one of his contemporaries,[i] who writes of the baptism of heretics, speak of themselves as the prime ministers of baptism; who only had power to give it, with all the ceremonies and solemnities belonging to it: and when it was given by the inferior clergy, in cases of necessity, as to the clinics upon a sick bed, the want of those ceremonies was either supplied by the

[e] Can. Apost. c. xxxviii. (Labbé, vol. i. p. 33.) Οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ διάκονοι ἄνευ γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν ἐπιτελείτωσαν. αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ πεπιστευμένος τὸν λαὸν τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ τὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν λόγον ἀπαιτηθησόμενος.

[f] Ignat. Epist. ad Smyrn. n. viii. (Russel, Patr. Apostol. vol. ii. p. 50.) Οὐκ ἐξόν ἐστι χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου οὔτε βαπτίζειν, οὔτε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν, ἀλλ' ὃ ἂν ἐκεῖνος δοκιμάσῃ, τοῦτο καὶ τῷ Θεῷ εὐάρεστον.

[g] Tertul. de Bapt. c. xvii. (Paris. 1664, p. 230, C. 2.) Dandi quidem habet jus summus sacerdos, qui est episcopus: dehinc presbyteri et diaconi; non tamen sine episcopi auctoritate, propter ecclesiæ honorem; quo salvo, salva pax est.

[h] Cyprian. de Exhortat. Martyr. in Præfat. p. 168. Nos tantum, qui Domino permittente primum baptisma credentibus dedimus, ad aliud quoque singulos præparemus.

[i] Anonym. de Bapt. Hæret. ad calcem Cyprian. p. 26. Siquidem per nos baptisma tradetur, integre et solenniter et per omnia quæ scripta sunt, adsignetur, atque sine ulla ullius rei separatione tradatur: aut si a minore clero per necessitatem traditum fuerit, eventum exspectemus, ut aut suppleatur a nobis, aut a Domino supplendum reservetur.

Digitized by Google

bishop in confirmation, upon the party's recovery, or by God himself, in calling them to the state of martyrdom. This shews, that they thought baptism chiefly to be the bishop's office; and when it was done by others, it was still done by his authority, and reputed as his act, which he also ratified as occasion required, by adding what was wanting in the circumstances of the solemnity, in a subsequent confirmation. The same is also asserted by St. Ambrose,[k] "That though presbyters do baptize, yet they derive the authority of their ministry from the chief priest;" that is, the bishop. And the author of the Comments upon St. Paul's Epistles, under the name of St. Ambrose, says, in general,[l] none of the clergy were to meddle with any office to which they were not appointed. But no one expresses himself more fully or plainly upon this head than St. Jerome: "The welfare of the Church," says he,[m] "depends upon the dignity and veneration of the chief priest; on whom if there was not some extraordinary and eminent power conferred, there would be as many schisms in the Church as there are priests. Hence it is, that neither presbyters nor deacons have any right to baptize without the chrism and command of their bishop." So that this point was clear among the ancients, beyond all dispute, that presbyters had only a derivative and subordinate power to baptize as well as others; and so long as they kept to this rule, their baptisms were regular and lawful, as done in conformity to the established rules and orders of the Church: but if they set themselves in opposition to their bishop, and either acted without or against his consent, as absolute and independent of him, then their baptisms, and all their other offices and

[k] Ambros. de Sacram. lib. iii. c. i. (Paris. 1836, vol. iv. p. 126.) Licet enim presbyteri fecerint, tamen exordium ministerii a summo est sacerdote.

[l] Ibid. in Ephes. iv. p. 943. Rectores et cetera officia in ecclesiis sunt ordinata, ut nullus de clero auderet, qui ordinatus non esset, præsumere officium, quod sciret non sibi creditum vel concessum.

[m] Hieron. Dial. cum Lucifer. c. iv. (Venet. Vallars. vol. ii. p. 182, A.) Ecclesiæ salus in summi sacerdotis dignitate pendet [ac veneratione consistit]: cui si non exors quædam, et ab omnibus eminens detur potestas, tot in ecclesiis efficientur schismata, quot sacerdotes. Inde ideo venit, ut sine chrismate et jussione episcopi neque presbyter neque diaconus jus habeant baptizandi.

Digitized by Google

ministrations, were irregular and unlawful, because done in a schismatical way, and in a professed contempt of authority, and all the standing rules and laws of the Church.

### SECT. IV.—*By what Power Presbyters anciently Baptized, in ordinary or extraordinary Cases.*

Yet though such baptisms were very sinful and irregular in respect of the persons ministering, they were not esteemed to be utterly void and null in respect of the persons baptized. Whence it follows, that a plain distinction must needs have been made always between the irregularity and the invalidity of any baptism; since the want of a lawful commission and authority would render the act of administration sinful and irregular, but not absolutely invalid. It is, therefore, here very material to inquire into this, How it came to pass, that baptism, ministered by a presbyter illegally and without commission, was nevertheless esteemed valid, notwithstanding the sinfulness of the act of ministration? It is resolved by some into the indelible character and power of the priesthood, which is given to a presbyter at his ordination, by which they think all his ministerial acts stand good, though done in an irregular manner against the laws and canons of the Church: and that a priest cannot be divested of this power after he is once legally ordained to it. But this could not be the ground upon which the ancients went, for several reasons. 1. Because they did not suppose baptism founded wholly upon sacerdotal powers, nor tied so absolutely to the office of a priest, but that it might, in ordinary cases also, be administered by deacons, if they had the bishop's commission; and by laymen in extraordinary cases of pressing necessity, if they had the bishop's license and authority to do it, as we shall see hereafter. 2. The indelible character of a priest does not authorize or qualify him to act contrary to the commission of his bishop: for then his baptizing would be both authorized and unauthorized, regular and irregular, lawful and unlawful, at the same time, and in the very same act and respect, which is a manifest contradiction. Then, also, a priest could never be deposed from his

Digitized by Google

office, or have his commission recalled, or his function legally taken from him, be his crimes ever so great, and deserving ecclesiastical censure: once a priest he would be always a priest; and they who gave him his commission, would have no authority to withdraw his commission, and reduce him to the state of a layman, in the most urgent and necessary case that could be conceived;—which is contrary to the whole tenour of ecclesiastical discipline, and quite cuts the sinews of episcopal power in the Church. For these reasons it is evident, the ancients could not think the legal power of baptizing belonged to a man, barely as he was a priest; but as he was a man invested with such power by his legal superior, whether he was priest or deacon; and that power subject to certain laws, which if he did not observe, his acts were irregular and unlawful; and, if he persisted obstinately to contradict such rules, the same superior who gave him his legal authority to baptize, had a legal authority to withdraw it again, and exclude him from the ordinary exercise of any office of the ecclesiastical function. Whence it follows, that the irregular baptisms of such priests being esteemed valid, so as not to be repeated, though irregularly and unlawfully given, could not be thought valid upon the notion of their being once ordained priests, and having an indelible character of the priesthood upon them; but upon some other notion and foundation, which equally extended to deacons as well as priests, and made the baptism of a deacon, though irregularly and unlawfully performed, as valid as that of a priest in the same circumstances: and that must be upon one of these two grounds, either that baptism, by whomsoever Christian performed, was valid and not to be repeated, provided it was done with due matter and form; or else that the bishops of the Church, as chief ministers of baptism, had power to receive and confirm those baptisms which were otherwise irregularly, and in opposition to their authority and commission, performed in the Church. But however it was, this is certain, that the validity of an irregular priest's baptism was not owing to his indelible character; since the baptism of deacons and laymen, who had not the character of priests, was sometimes authorized

Digitized by Google

and allowed as valid; which is evident from plain matters of fact, which I now proceed to give a further account of.

## SECT. V. — *Of the Power granted anciently to Deacons to Baptize.*

Deacons, by some ancient canons, are invested with the power of baptizing in ordinary cases, as well as priests. It is plain Tertullian so understood it; for he puts presbyters and deacons together,[n] as the ordinary ministers of baptism next after the bishop, and under his direction: he makes no distinction in the power given to those two orders; for the one had as much power to baptize as the other, and they both alike subordinately acted under the bishop, in whom, as chief priest, the original power of baptizing was lodged, and from whose authority they received their power. St. Jerome was of the same mind; for he says,[o] "Without the commission of the bishop, neither presbyter nor deacon had any right to baptize:" which implies, that by his commission they had each of them the ordinary power. Thus it was in the Churches of Spain, at the time of the Council of Eliberis, in one of whose canons there is a provision made,[p] "That if a deacon who presides over a people, shall baptize any persons without a bishop or presbyter, the bishop in that case shall perfect what was wanting in the ceremony, by his benediction." It is not said he shall rebaptize them, because they were only baptized by a deacon; but he shall ratify the baptism by his consummating act, which was his imposition of hands in confirmation. From whence it is evident, that deacons in Spain were then allowed to be the ordinary ministers of baptism. The same appears from

[n] Tertul. de Bapt. c. xvii. (Paris. 1664, p. 230.) Dandi quidem jus habet summus sacerdos, qui est episcopus: dehinc presbyteri et diaconi; non tamen sine episcopi auctoritate, &c.

[o] Hieron. Dial. cum Lucifer. c. iv. (Venet. Vallars. vol. ii. p. 182, A. 5.) Sine jussione episcopi neque presbyter neque diaconus jus habeant baptizandi. — Ibid. In villulis, aut in castellis, aut in remotioribus locis, per presbyteros et diaconos baptizati, &c.

[p] Conc. Illiber. c. lxxvii. (Labbé, vol. i. p. 978.) Si quis diaconus regens plebem, sine episcopo vel presbytero aliquos baptizaverit, episcopus eos per benedictionem perficere debebit.

Digitized by Google

St. Cyril's Catechetical Discourses to have been the custom of the Churches in Palestine: for he tells his catechumens, when the time of baptism came, they might go either to bishops, or presbyters, or deacons:[q] "For the grace of God was to be had in villages as well as cities, and came upon the unlearned as well as learned, upon bond as well as free; seeing that grace was not from men, but a gift of God by the hand of men:" this denotes that deacons in country villages had the ordinary power of baptizing. And so we find, in the first Council of Orleans,[r] a decree implying that the same power was allowed them in the French Churches. For in one of the canons of that Council, deacons and presbyters are joined together as ministers of baptism, both in ordinary and extraordinary cases: for it is said, "That if a deacon or a presbyter shall, for any private guilt, have withdrawn himself from the communion of the altar, under the profession of a penitent; yet, even in that case, such a deacon or presbyter, if there happen a case of evident necessity, and no others can be had, may baptize any man that desires baptism." Certainly they who authorized deacons in such singular circumstances and disadvantages to baptize, even when they were under a sort of discipline and penance, must needs allow them the same privilege as presbyters had, to baptize in all other ordinary cases. Yet some other ancient rules seem absolutely to forbid deacons to minister baptism in ordinary cases, confining the office only to bishops and presbyters. Among those called the Apostolical Canons, there are four that speak of the ministers of baptism; and those are there only bishops and presbyters, but no mention is made of deacons. One canon says,[s] "If a

[q] Cyril. Catech. xvii. n. xvi. Κατὰ γὰρ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ βαπτίσματος, ὅταν προσέλθῃς ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπισκόπων ἢ πρεσβυτέρων, ἢ διακόνων· ἀπανταχοῦ γὰρ ἡ χάρις, καὶ ἐν κώμαις, καὶ ἐν πόλεσι, καὶ ἐπὶ ἰδιωτῶν, καὶ ἐλλογίμων, καὶ ἐπὶ δούλων, καὶ ἐλευθέρων· ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἡ χάρις, ἀλλ' ἐκ Θεοῦ δι' ἀνθρώπων ἡ δόσις. (Paris. 1609, p. 467, line 11.)

[r] Conc. Aurel. I. c. xii. Si diaconus, vel presbyter, pro reatu suo se ab altaris communione sub pœnitentis professione submoverit; sic quoque si alii defuerint, et causa certæ necessitatis exoritur, poscentem baptismum liceat baptizare. (Labbé, vol. iv. p. 1407.)

[s] Can. Apost. xlv. (al. xxxviii.) (Labbé, vol. i. p. 36.) Ἐπίσκοπον, ἢ πρεσβύτερον αἱρετικῶν διξάμενον βάπτισμα, ἢ θυσίαν, καθαιρεῖσθαι προστάσσομεν.

Digitized by Google

bishop or presbyter receives the baptism of heretics, he is to be deposed." Another says,[t] "If a bishop or presbyter rebaptizes one that has been truly baptized before, or does not baptize again one that has been profanely polluted in baptism by the impious, he shall be deposed as one that derides the cross and death of Christ, and makes no difference between true and false priests." Another canon says,[u] "If any bishop or presbyter observe not the form of baptism prescribed by our Lord, 'In the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,' but baptizes in the name of three unoriginated Principles, or three Sons, or three Holy Ghosts, he shall be deposed." And a fourth canon also pronounces the same censure against any bishops or presbyters who did not use three immersions in the sacred mystery.[w] In all these canons there is not the least mention of deacons; because by them only bishops and priests are supposed to be the ordinary ministers of baptism, and not deacons. So, likewise, in the Constitutions, under the name of the Apostles', all the inferior clergy, among which the deacons are comprehended, are prohibited to minister baptism: "We do not permit," say they,[x] "the rest of the clergy to baptize,—as readers, singers, doorkeepers, subdeacons, but only bishops and presbyters, to whom the deacons are to minister. And they that presume to act otherwise, shall bear the judgment of Korah and his company." The deacons are here wholly excluded from the office of baptism, as well as the rest of the inferior clergy; and in some ancient copies they were

[t] Can. Apost. xlvi. (al. xxxix.) (Labbé, vol. i. p. 36.) Ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος τὸν κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἔχοντα βάπτισμα, ἐὰν ἄνωθεν βαπτίσῃ, ἢ τὸν μεμολυσμένον παρὰ τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσῃ, καθαιρείσθω.

[u] Ibid. c. xlviii. (al. xli.) (Labbé, vol. i. p. 36.) Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος, κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου διάταξιν μὴ βαπτίσῃ εἰς Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱὸν, καὶ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, ἀλλὰ εἰς τρεῖς Ἀνάρχους, ἢ τρεῖς Υἱοὺς, ἢ τρεῖς Παρακλήτους καθαιρείσθω.

[w] Ibid. c. xlix. (al. xlii.) (Labbé, vol. i. p. 36.) Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος, μὴ τρία βαπτίσματα μιᾶς μυήσεως ἐπιτελίσῃ, ἀλλ' ἓν βάπτισμα, εἰς τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κυρίου διδόμενον, καθαιρείσθω.

[x] Constitut. Apost. lib. iii. c. xi. (Labbé, vol. i. p. 318.) Ἀλλ' οὔτε τοῖς λαϊκοῖς κληρικοῖς ἐπιτρέπομεν βαπτίζειν· οἷον ἀναγνώσταις, ἢ ψάλταις, ἢ πυλωροῖς, ἢ ὑπηρέταις, ἢ [leg. ἀλλ' ἢ] μόνοις ἐπισκόποις, καὶ πρεσβυτέροις, ἐξυπηρετουμένων αὐτοῖς τῶν διακόνων· οἱ δὲ τολμῶντες τοῦτο, τῶν Κοριτῶν ὑποίσουσι τὴν δίκην.

Digitized by Google

excluded by name; for in Georgius Hamartolus's citation of this passage, as Cotelerius has observed,[y] the prohibition names deacons expressly among the rest that are forbidden to baptize; and if they had not been excepted by name, yet it were so to be understood: for he that confines baptism only to the office of bishops and presbyters, must be supposed thereby to exclude deacons, unless it be pretended that deacons are of the same order either with bishops or presbyters; which the Constitutions are so far from asserting, that they make deacons only ministers to the other two orders. But, in another place, the Constitutions speak yet more expressly against deacons' baptizing: for they thus distinguish the offices of presbyter and deacon from each other:[z] "A presbyter is to teach, to offer the eucharist, to baptize, and to give the blessing to the people; but a deacon is only to minister to the bishop and the presbyters, and not to perform the rest." And again,[a] "A deacon does not give the blessing, but receives it from the bishop or the presbyter; he does not baptize, he does not offer the eucharist; but, when the bishop or presbyter has offered, he distributes it to the people, not as a priest, but as one that ministers to the priests." Yet, notwithstanding this, it is asserted by the same author, that a deacon may baptize, if he has a commission and authority from his bishop to do it; as he supposes Philip the deacon and Ananias to have had a special call from God. "If any one," says he,[b] "shall plead the example

[y] Coteler. Not. in Constitut. Apost. lib. iii. c. ix. tom. i. p. 283, b.

[z] Constitut. Apost. lib. iii. c. xx. (Labbé, vol. i. p. 326.) Τὸν μὲν πρεσβύτερον διδάσκειν, ἀναφέρειν, βαπτίζειν, εὐλογεῖν τὸν λαόν· τὸν δὲ διάκονον ἐξυπηρετεῖσθαι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις· τουτέστι, διακονεῖν· οὐ μὴν καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ διενεργεῖν.

[a] Ibid. lib. viii. c. xxviii. (Labbé, vol. i. p. 494, C. 4.) Διάκονος οὐκ εὐλογεῖ· οὐ δίδωσιν εὐλογίαν· λαμβάνει δὲ παρὰ ἐπισκόπου καὶ πρεσβυτέρου· οὐ βαπτίζει· οὐ προσφέρει· τοῦ δὲ ἐπισκόπου προσενεγκόντος ἢ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου, αὐτὸς ἐπιδίδωσι τῷ λαῷ, οὐχ ὡς ἱερεύς, ἀλλ' ὡς διακονούμενος ἱερεῦσιν.

[b] Ibid. lib. viii. c. xlvi. (Labbé, vol. i. p. 509, D.) Εἰ δὲ Φίλιππον τὸν διάκονον ἡμῶν καὶ Ἀνανίαν τὸν πιστὸν ἀδελφὸν αἰτιῶνταί τινες, ὅτι ὁ μὲν τὸν εὐνοῦχον ἐβάπτισεν, ὁ δὲ ἐμὲ Παῦλον, ἀγνοοῦσιν αὐτοὶ, ἃ λέγομεν ἡμεῖς· εἴπομεν γὰρ, ὅτι οὐχ ἑαυτῷ τις ἁρπάζει τὸ ἱερατικὸν ἀξίωμα, ἀλλ' ἢ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ λαμβάνει, ὡς Μελχισιδὲκ καὶ Ἰώβ· ἢ παρὰ ἀρχιερέως, ὡς Ἀαρὼν παρὰ Μωσέως· οὐκοῦν καὶ Φίλιππος καὶ Ἀνανίας οὐχ ἑαυτοὺς προείλοντο, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ προεχειρίσθησαν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως τοῦ ἀσυγκρίτου Θεοῦ.

Digitized by Google

of Philip the deacon and Ananias, the faithful brother,—the one of which baptized the eunuch, and the other me Paul,—they understand not what we say; for we say that no man takes to himself the dignity of the priesthood, but either he is called of God, as Melchizedec and Job; or he receives it from the chief priest, as Aaron from Moses. Therefore Philip and Ananias did not appoint themselves, but were chosen by Christ the Chief Priest, the incomparable God." St. Chrysostom seems to have been of the same opinion, that the ordinary office of baptizing belonged only to priests, and not to deacons, though deacons, in cases of necessity, might do it. In his discourses of the Priesthood, he thus argues for, and magnifies, the power of the priest:[c] "It is plain madness to despise so great a power, without which we cannot obtain salvation, or the good things that are promised us. For if no one can enter into the kingdom of heaven, except he be born of water and the Holy Ghost; and he that eateth not the flesh of the Lord, and drinketh not his blood, is deprived of eternal life; and all these things are performed by no other but those sacred hands,—I mean the hands of the priest; how can any one, without these, either escape the fire of hell, or obtain the crown that is laid up in heaven?" It is certain St. Chrysostom, in these words, excludes deacons from the ordinary power of baptizing, as much as he does laymen. Which the learned Dr. Forbes,[d] who first produced this passage against lay-baptism, was so sensible of, that he equally concludes the baptism of deacons to be invalid, as well as that of laymen. But he mistakes St. Chrysostom's meaning; for he did not intend so to confine baptism to the hands of a priest, as to make it simply and absolutely unlawful, in any case whatsoever, for a deacon to administer it: for, in case of necessity, he not only permits, but positively

[c] Chrysostom. de Sacerdot. lib. iii. c. v. tom. iv. opp. p. 29, (edit. Francof.) Πάντα δὲ ταῦτα δι' ἑτέρου μὲν οὐδενὸς, μόνον δὲ διὰ τῶν ἁγίων ἐκείνων ἐπιτελεῖται χειρῶν, τῶν τοῦ ἱερέως λέγω, κ. τ. λ. (Paris. 1614, p. 33, D. 4.)——See Origen, lib. x. chap. ii. sect. xxi. vol. iii. p. 299.

[d] Forbes. Instruct. Historico-Theol. lib. x. c. xiv. n. viii. Chrysostomus, non obstante necessitate, ministerium baptismi solis vindicat sacerdotibus, non minus quam ministerium eucharistiæ; quam non nisi a sacerdote consecrari posse, omnes fatentur, 'Manifesta,' inquit, 'dementia est,' &c.

Digitized by Google

enjoins, deacons to baptize. "For," says he,[e] "if there be a necessity, and a child be found unbaptized, and ready to die, it is lawful for a deacon to baptize it:"—which shews that he only made priests the ordinary ministers of baptism; and that it was the contempt of their ministry only, when it might be had, which he so inveighs against, and not the bare want of it, when it could not be had in cases extraordinary and of extreme necesssity, in which it might be supplied by a deacon. And this must be the meaning of Epiphanius, when he says,[f] "That deacons are not permitted to celebrate any mystery or sacrament in the church, but only to minister in the celebration:" that is, they were not to do it in ordinary cases, when a priest was at hand, but only to assist the priest, as the principal agent in the performance of it. St. Hilary was of the same mind:[g] for he reckons baptism a part of the apostolical office and ministry; and that it was, therefore, only an extraordinary exigence that made Philip the deacon baptize the eunuch, who had such an impatient desire of baptism that he could not stay to be baptized by an apostle. The canons of the Church are, many times, peremptory against deacons' baptizing in ordinary cases; but they always except the case of necessity, the time of sickness, and disability or want of other ministers. Among the decrees of Gelasius, this is one:[h] "Let not a deacon presume to baptize without the bishop or presbyter, unless they be far absent, and an extreme necessity compel him; in which case it is sometimes allowed to lay-Christians to do it." Cotelerius[i] and Sirmond give us a canon out of

[e] Chrysostom. Hom. lxi. (tom. vii. edit. Savil. p. 423.) Ἐὰν γένηται ἀνάγκη, καὶ εὑρεθῇ παιδίον ἀβάπτιστον, καὶ μέλλῃ τελευτᾶν, ἔξὸν τὸν διάκονον βαπτίσαι.

[f] Epiphan. Hæres. lxxix. Collyrid. n. iv. (Colon. 1682, vol. i. p. 1061, A.) Καὶ γὰρ οὔτε διάκονοι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησιαστικῇ τάξει ἐπιστεύθησάν τι μυστήριον ἐπιτελεῖν, ἀλλὰ μόνον διακονεῖν τὰ ἐπιτελούμενα.

[g] Hilar. Comment. in Psalm. lxvii. p. 242, edit. Colon. 1617. Sacramentum ipsum baptismi adeo impatientis desiderii cupiditate præveniens, ut a diacono ministerium apostolici officii, salutis suæ cupidus, exigeret.

[h] Gelas. Epist. ix. ad Episc. Lucan. c. vii. (Labbé, vol. iv. p. 1190.) Absque episcopo vel presbytero baptizare non audeant diaconi; nisi, prædictis fortasse officiis longius constitutis, necessitas extrema compellat. Quod et laicis Christianis facere plerumque conceditur.

[i] Conc. Roman. c. vii. apud Coteler. Not. in Constitut. Apost. lib. iii. c. ix.

Digitized by Google

one of the Roman Councils, which forbids deacons to baptize at any other time beside Easter; but at that time deacons, as well as presbyters, are allowed to grant remission of sins; that is, to baptize in the parish-churches. At other times, even in case of sickness, none but a presbyter is authorized to do it, because he only had power to offer the oblation. The reason of this difference, in the Roman Church, seems to have been this: that in a great and populous city, where there were many churches and many presbyters, and but seven deacons, there could never scarce any such case of necessity happen by the sickness of a catechumen, but that a presbyter might be had, rather than a deacon, to give him baptism: but at the solemn time of Easter, such multitudes came together at once to be baptized, that the bishop and all his presbyters were hardly sufficient to perform the whole ministry; and therefore deacons, in that exigence, were taken in to be their assistants. Where we may observe two things: first, that they did this by the bishop's license and authority; and, secondly, that only in a time of great exigence, when a case of necessity required it. Isidore of Seville, who wrote a considerable time after this, observes the like of deacons' ministering baptism in the age he lived in. "It is evident," says he,[k] "that the ministry of baptism belongs only to priests: nor is it lawful for deacons themselves to perform the mystery without the bishop or a presbyter; unless in their absence, when the extreme necessity of sickness requires and compels them to do it; in which case it is often permitted to faithful laymen." And thus it continued for many ages after in the English Church, as appears from

Paschæ tempore, presbyter et diaconus per parochias dare remissionem peccatorum et ministerium implere consueverunt, etiam præsente episcopo: in fontem quoque ipsi descendunt, illi in officio sunt: sed illius (*al.* Episcopi) nomini facti summa conceditur. Reliquis vero temporibus, ubi ægritudinis necessitas consequi unumquemque compellit, specialiter presbytero licentia est per salutaris aquæ gratiam dare indulgentiam peccatorum, quoniam et munus ipsi licet, causa mundationis, offerre: diaconis vero nulla licentia invenitur esse concessa; sed quod semel forte contigit usurpare, per necessitatem dicuntur excusati, &c. (Vol. i. p. 282.)

[k] Isidor. de Offic. lib. ii. c. xxiv. Constat baptisma solis sacerdotibus esse tractandum, ejusque mysterium nec ipsis diaconis explere est licitum absque episcopo vel presbytero: nisi, his procul absentibus, ultima languoris necessitas cogat. Quod et laicis fidelibus plerumque permittitur, &c.

Digitized by Google

the canons of the Council of York,[l] held in the year 1195; and the Council of London,[m] in the year 1200; and the canons of St. Edmund (an. 1236,) mentioned in Linwood's Provincial.[n] In all which deacons are forbidden to baptize, except upon urgent necessity, when the priest cannot, or is absent, or through folly and indiscretion will not, and a child or a sick person is in imminent danger of death. And so it was in some parts of the Greek Churches in former ages, as is clear from St. Chrysostom's testimony alleged before; and from Theodoret, who says,[o] "When a presbyter was not at hand, if a pressing necessity required, even a deacon was compelled to give baptism to any one that wanted it." He might not then do it ordinarily, but only in cases of necessity, when a presbyter or priest could not be found to do it. And so it continued to be the rule of the Church of Constantinople for several ages after; as we learn from the canons of Nicephorus, the patriarch of the ninth century; where, in extraordinary cases of necessity,[p] a simple monk and a deacon are equally qualified to baptize. Which implies, that neither of them were qualified to do it in ordinary cases: for the simple monks were not in holy orders, but properly laymen, being opposed to those whom the Greeks called *ἱερομοναχοί*, or 'monks in sacred orders,' who pertained to the ecclesiastical hierarchy and function: as I have more fully shewed in another place.[q] Now, then, deacons being joined

[l] Conc. Eborac. c. v. (Labbé, vol. x. p. 1793.) Diaconus non baptizet, nec corpus Christi cuiquam eroget, nisi summa et gravi necessitate urgente. Apud Roger. de Hoveden. Histor. an. 1195.

[m] Conc. Londin. c. iii. (Labbé, vol. xi. p. 14.) Non liceat diaconibus baptizare, vel pœnitentias dare, nisi duplici necessitate, videlicet quia sacerdos non potest, vel absens, vel stulte non vult, et mors imminet puero vel ægro.

[n] Linwood, Provinc. lib. iii. tit. xxiv. de Baptismo. Præcipimus, quod diaconi baptizare non præsumant, nisi in his casibus, quum sacerdos non potest, vel absens est, vel stulte vel indiscrete non vult, et mors imminet puero vel ægroto.

[o] Theodoret. Com. in 2 Paralipom. c. xxix. quæst. i. p. 389. *Πρεσβυτέρου οὐ παρόντος, καὶ τῆς χρείας ἰσχυούσης, ἀναγκάζεται καὶ διάκονος προσφέρειν τῷ δεομένῳ τὸ βάπτισμα.*

[p] Niceph. c. xiii. ap. Leuncl. Jur. Græc. Rom. tom. i. lib. iii. p. 196. *Κατὰ περίστασιν καὶ μοναχὸς λαϊκὸς βαπτίζει. ἀσπάτως καὶ διάκονος κατὰ περίστασιν βαπτίζει.*

[q] Origin. Eccles. book vii. chap. ii. sect. vii. vol. ii. p. 252.

Digitized by Google

with simple monks, could not be supposed to be the ordinary ministers of baptism, but only qualified to do it in extraordinary cases. Hence it is most evident, that so many of the ancients as excluded deacons from the ordinary ministration of baptism,—did it upon this supposition, that the ordinary ministration of baptism was the proper office of the priests or presbyters alone, who were a superior order above deacons; but yet, that in cases of extreme necessity it was lawful for others, besides priests, to minister baptism by the bishop's authority; and upon this ground, in such cases, it was esteemed also the office of deacons. So necessary, we see, was this distinction between ordinary and extraordinary cases, to adjust matters in the practice of the Primitive Church; whilst, on the one hand, the honour and dignity of the priesthood was to be preserved, and yet deacons allowed, on the other hand, to minister baptism in some cases, though they were not priests in the strict sense, in the opinion of those who allowed them to do it.

### SECT. VI. — *Whether the inferior Clergy were allowed to Baptize?*

The next question is concerning subdeacons, and the rest of the inferior orders, who went by the name of 'the minor clergy' in the Primitive Church. These were not properly of Divine, but only of ecclesiastical institution, for helps to the superior clergy in their ministration; as has been fully proved against the Romanists in another Book.[r] Now the question about these at present is, Whether in any cases they had power to baptize? That they had no power in ordinary cases is evident from what has been before discoursed of deacons: for if deacons themselves had not generally such a power allowed them, it would be absurd to think that the inferior orders below them should have it. The author of the Apostolical Constitutions excludes them all by name from this office,[s] readers, singers, doorkeepers, subdeacons, threatening them with the punishment of Korah,

[r] Origin. Eccles. book iii. chap. i. vol. i.

[s] Constitut. Apost. lib. iii. c. xi. See before, note (x), p. 24. — So Ambros. Com. in Ephes. iv. Neque clerici vel laici baptizant.

Digitized by Google

if they presumed to invade it. But this is to be understood of the ordinary ministration of baptism, from which deacons also were excluded. The question then runs out further, Whether in any extraordinary cases they were allowed to give it? But there are few among the ancients that have, in direct terms, decided this question; so we must judge only by parity of reason what they thought upon it. The ancient author of the book concerning the Baptism of Heretics, published by Rigaltius and Bishop Fell among the works of St. Cyprian, seems to say,[t] that the minor clergy, in cases of necessity, might baptize: but learned men are not agreed what that author means by 'the minor clergy.' Cotelerius[u] and Valesius[w] are of opinion, that it signifies all the inferior clergy below bishops and presbyters: and if so, it were a plain proof indeed that the inferior clergy, in cases of necessity, might baptize. But Rigaltius and Bishop Fell, in their notes upon the place, think 'the minor clergy' only means presbyters and deacons, who were called so in respect of the bishop, their superior, who commonly administered baptism himself, and when he could not do it in person, gave his commission to presbyters and deacons in his stead. I will not venture to decide so nice a controversy between these learned men; but I think the main question may easily be decided another way: for if the ancients granted liberty to

[t] Anonym. de Bapt. Hæret. ad calcem Cyprian. p. 26. Si a minore clero per necessitatem traditum fuerit, &c. See following note.

[u] Coteler. Not. in Constitut. Apost. lib. iii. c. ix. Notabilia sunt præ ceteris verba scriptoris anonymi de non denuo baptizandis, qui semel in nomine Christi tincti fuerint, in observationibus Nicolai Rigaltii ad S. Cyprianum, p. 134: 'Et ideo quum salus nostra in baptismate Spiritus, quod plerumque cum baptismate aquæ conjunctum est, sit constituta; siquidem per nos baptisma tradetur, integre et solenniter et per omnia quæ scripta sunt adsignetur, atque sine ulla ullius rei separatione tradatur: aut si a minore clero per necessitatem traditum fuerit, eventum exspectemus, ut aut suppleatur a nobis, aut a Domino supplendum reservetur.'

[w] Vales. Not. in Euseb. lib. vi. c. xliii. (Amstelod. 1695, p. 121.) Idem scriptor clerum distinguit in majorem et minorem. Et minorem quidem clerum appellat diaconos et reliquos inferiores ordines: ut quum dicit (p. 129), 'Aut si,' &c. Et multo clarius, p. 134: 'Et ideo quum salus nostra,' &c. (See note before.) Ubi vides presbyteros ab hominibus minoris cleri aperte distingui. Ait enim minoris cleri homines, ingruente tantum necessitate, baptismum conferre: quod presbyteris nequaquam convenit.

Digitized by Google

mere monks and laymen to baptize in extraordinary cases, it will readily follow, that they would never scruple to grant the same power to the inferior clergy, who were, at least, one degree above monks and laymen. We cannot, therefore, better determine this question than by proceeding to that other, concerning the power granted to laymen in reference to the administration of baptism, which is the grand question in this whole affair.

SECT. VII.—*Laymen prohibited to Baptize in ordinary Cases.*

Now here, first of all, it is certain that laymen were always debarred from meddling with the administration of baptism in all ordinary cases. All the former allegations, which make it the proper office of bishops and presbyters, even to the exclusion of deacons, are certainly of much greater force against the usurpations of laymen. Besides, they are sometimes prohibited in particular by name: as in the Apostolical Constitutions, three times at least:[x] "We do not permit laymen to perform any sacerdotal office, as the sacrifice of the eucharist, or baptism, or imposition of hands, or the lesser or the greater benediction: for 'No man taketh this honour to himself, but he that is called of God.' This dignity is given only by the laying on of the bishop's hands; but he that takes it to himself without commission, shall sustain the punishment of Uzzias." The author, under the name of St. Ambrose, says, therefore,[y] "That from the time of the apostles, the inferior clergy and laymen were prohibited to baptize." Which, at least, must be understood of a prohibition to usurp the office, and to do it in ordinary cases.

[x] Constitut. Apost. lib. iii. c. x. (Labbé, vol. i. p. 315.) Ἀλλ' οὔτι λαϊκοῖς ἐπιτρέπομεν ποιεῖν τι τῶν ἱερατικῶν ἔργων· οἷον θυσίαν, ἢ βάπτισμα, ἢ χειροθεσίαν, ἢ εὐλογίαν μικρὰν ἢ μεγάλην. Οὐχ ἑαυτῷ γὰρ τις λαμβάνει τὴν τιμὴν, ἀλλὰ ὁ καλούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Διὰ γὰρ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ ἐπισκόπου δίδοται ἡ τοιαύτη ἀξία. ὁ δὲ μὴ ἐγχειρισθεὶς ταύτην, ἀλλ' ἁρπάσας αὐτὴν ἑαυτῷ, τὴν τιμωρίαν τοῦ Ὀζίου ὑποστήσεται. —— See Constitut. Apost. lib. ii. c. xxvii. lib. viii. c. xlvi.

[y] Ambros. Com. in Ephes. iv. p. 948. Hinc ergo est, unde nunc neque diaconi in populo prædicant, neque clerici vel laici baptizant.

Digitized by Google

## Sect. VIII. — *Yet allowed to do it sometimes in Cases extraordinary.*

But still the grand question remains, Whether ever they were allowed to do it in extraordinary cases of extreme necessity, when no public minister could be procured to do it? And this must be resolved in the affirmative, as to the general practice of the Church, though there are some exceptions of particular Churches to the contrary. Tertullian, I think, is the first writer that speaks directly to this point, and he delivers himself thus upon the matter:[z] "The chief priest, who is the bishop, has power to give baptism, and after him presbyters and deacons; yet not without the authority of the bishop, for the honour of the Church, in the preservation of which peace is preserved. In another respect laymen have also a right to give it; for what is received in common, may be given in common. Baptism is God's peculiar, and may be conferred by all: but laymen are, in a much greater degree, obliged by the rules of modesty in the use of their power, since they who are superior to them, are obliged not to assume to themselves the office which belongs to the bishop only. Emulation is the mother of strife. 'All things are lawful,' says the holy apostle; 'but all things are not expedient.' Therefore it ought to suffice them to use this power in necessities, when the condition of the place, or time, or person, requires it: for then their charitable assistance is accepted, when the

[z] Tertul. de Bapt. c. xvii. (Paris. 1664, p. 230, C. 2.) Dandi quidem habet jus summus sacerdos, qui est episcopus: dehinc presbyteri et diaconi; non tamen sine episcopi auctoritate, propter ecclesiæ honorem, quo salvo, salva pax est. Alioquin etiam laicis jus est. Quod enim ex æquo accipitur, ex æquo dari potest; nisi episcopi jam, aut presbyteri, aut diaconi vocantur, discentes. Domini sermo non debet abscondi ab ullo. Proinde et baptismus, æque Dei census, ab omnibus exerceri potest: sed quanto magis laicis disciplina verecundiæ et modestiæ incumbit? quum ea majoribus competant, ne sibi adsumant dicatum episcopis officium episcopatus. Æmulatio, schismatum mater est. 'Omnia licere,' dixit sanctissimus apostolus, 'sed non omnia expedire.' Sufficiat scilicet, in necessitatibus utaris; sicubi, aut loci, aut temporis, aut personæ conditio compellit. Tunc enim constantia succurrentis excipitur, quum urget circumstantia periclitantis. Quoniam reus erit perditi hominis, si supersederit præstare quod libere potuit.



Digitized by Google

circumstance of one in danger presses them to it. And in this case he would be guilty of a man's destruction, that omitted to do what he lawfully might." Mr. Dodwell[a] and some others except against this passage of Tertullian, as expressing only his own private opinion, and not the common practice of the Church. But no learned man before ever thought so, as Mr. Dodwell himself confesses, and acknowledges his opinion to be a paradox. And there is this prejudice against it, from the coherence of Tertullian's discourse: that in the former part of it, he is certainly speaking of the practice of the Church, when he says, "Presbyters and deacons act by the bishop's authority, when they administer baptism in ordinary cases." It would be strange, then, if he should invert his discourse immediately in the next words, and not mean the practice of the Church when he comes to speak of laymen. But however this be, Tertullian's sense was, in the next age, confirmed by some public acts of the Church.

SECT. IX. — *The Testimony of the Council of Eliberis.*

About a hundred years after Tertullian, the Spanish bishops, assembled in the Council of Eliberis, made a public decree about this matter: they there appointed,[b] "That when men were on a voyage at sea, or in any place where no church was near at hand, if a catechumen happened to be extremely sick, and at the point of death, that then any Christian who had his own baptism entire, and was no bigamist, might baptize him." This authority was not given to all Christians in all cases, but with several limitations and restrictions. 1. It must be a case of absolute necessity, when baptism could not otherwise be had. 2. The person baptizing must have his own baptism entire: which Albaspiny understands of not lapsing after baptism.[c] Vos-

[a] Dodwell, de Jure Laicorum Sacerdotali, c. ii. n. ii. p. 52.

[b] Conc. Illiber. c. xxxviii. (Labbé, vol. i. p. 974.) Placuit peregre navigantes, aut si ecclesia in proximo non fuerit, posse fidelem, qui lavacrum suum integrum habet, nec sit bigamus, baptizare in necessitate infirmitatis positum catechumenum.

[c] Albaspin. (p. 999.) Putarim ista verba id indicare, qui post lavacrum non peccarit, neque pœnitentiam ullam subierit: quod peccato post baptismum

Digitized by Google

sius,[d] with better reason, supposes it to be opposed to clinic baptism, which was a less solemn and imperfect baptism, which made a man incapable of holy orders ever after; as I have shewn elsewhere,[e] from the ancient laws of the Church. And it was very often attended with another defect, which was the want of confirmation, and the gift of the Holy Ghost, by imposition of the hands of the bishop, which was not ordinarily sought for by clinics, who were baptized, in haste, upon a death-bed. For this reason these Spanish bishops denied such the privilege of baptizing in any case, whilst they allowed it to others. 3. They require also that the man must be no bigamist, because that also unqualified a person for sacred orders: and it was their intent, when a priest could not be had to administer baptism, only to authorize such laymen to do it, as had those proper qualifications that were requisite to obtain orders, and so bring them as near priests as they could. This is the most probable account I can give at present of these limitations: however, in the main, the matter is indisputable, that they plainly intended, in some extraordinary cases, to give laymen a license and authority to administer baptism; which could not then be said to be unauthorized in Spain, since it had the best authority the Church could give it, which is the determination and authority of a council. It will not here be material for any one to object, that this was but the determination of a private national council: for we are not now inquiring, what obligation any other Church is under to follow this rule, but only what was matter of fact, and the practice of the ancient Church. The Church of Rome varied from the rule of this Council many ages ago; for they allowed bigamists to

commisso, omnium, ut ita loquar, gratiarum et beneficiorum quæ acceperat, jacturam faceret: ideoque baptismum ejus qui deliquisset, non integrum, aut incorruptum videri amplius; quod ex illo Divinæ gratiæ, qua instructus erat, quasi gradu excidisset. &c.

[d] Vossius de Baptismo Disput. xi. n. iv. . . . hi vero excipiant tum illos, qui non perceperint integrum baptisma (ubi intelligi censeo in morbo adspersos: de quibus etiam dubitatum fuit, utrum fieri possint episcopi) tum illos, qui bigami forent, &c.

[e] Origin. Eccles. book iv. chap. iii. sect. ii. vol. i.

Digitized by Google

baptize,[f] as Auxilius informs us, though that was forbidden by the determination of this Spanish Council. But I proceed.

### SECT. X.— *Of the Church of Alexandria.*

Whilst this matter was thus determined in the West, there happened another famous transaction in the East, which drew on a like determination in the Church of Alexandria, if we may give credit to any of the ancient historians, Socrates, Sozomen, and Ruffin, who all relate it. Ruffin says, he had the story from the mouth of those who lived and conversed with Athanasius; and the account of it, according to his relation, is this:[g] "Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, on a certain day, being the festival of Peter the Martyr, after the solemn service of the Church was over, was entertaining himself with a prospect toward the sea, whilst he expected his clergy to come and dine with him. In his prospect, at some distance, upon the sea-shore, he beheld a number of youths at play, acting the part of a bishop, and doing all things which were used to be done in the Church: and viewing them intently for some time, he at last saw them come to the secret and mystical rites of religion. Upon which, being somewhat perplexed, he sent immediately for his clergy, and shewed them what he himself had seen; ordering them withal to go and bring the boys before him. Who being asked what play they were at, and what they had done, and after what manner; they at first denied all the whole matter, as children use to do, through fear; but afterward they told every thing in order as it was done, confessing that they had baptized certain catechumens, by the hands of Athanasius, who acted the part of the bishop in the play. Then examining further of those who were said to be baptized, what questions they

[f] Auxil. de Ordinat. Formosi, ad calcem Morini de Ordinationibus, c. x. Baptizati bigami; si necessitas incumbit, baptizare possunt; sacrum vero ordinem canonice accipere nequeunt.

[g] Ruffin. Hist. lib. i. c. xiv. Tempore, quo apud Alexandriam, Petri martyris diem Alexander episcopus agebat, quum post expleta solennia conventuros ad convivium suum clericos exspectaret in loco mari vicino; videt eminus puerorum

Digitized by Google

were asked, and what answers they made; and being likewise informed by him who had been the chief actor, when he found that all things had been done according to the rites of our religion: after he had conferred with a council of his clergy, he is said to have determined, that the baptism of those on whom water had been poured, with the proper interrogatories and responses, ought not to be repeated, but only have those things added which the priests were used to perform." Socrates[h] and Sozomen[i] have the same story, and the author of the Life of Athanasius,[k] in Photius, with Johannes Moschus,[l] and many others. They who find themselves pressed with this relation, take several ways to evade the force of it. Michael Glycas, a Greek historian, plainly inverts the bishop's determination, and says, he ordered them to be rebaptized: which is so manifest a prevarication, and affront to the faith of all the old historians, that it deserves no other answer, but to give it its true name of a bold falsification and imposture. Others incline to call in question the whole story, and tell us that learned men now generally also incline to reject it as a fiction. I know Spanheim, and some few others, do so, but the generality of learned men are not of that opinion: Archbishop Whitgift, Abbot, Cotelerius, Pagi, and many others that might be named, men of character in their age, have appeared in its behalf, and defended it as a genuine piece of history. And

supra oram maris ludum imitantium, ut fieri solet, episcopum, atque ea quæ in ecclesia geri mos est. Sed quum intentius diutine pueros inspectaret, videt ab his geri quædam etiam secretiora et mystica. Perturbatus illico vocari ad se clericos jubet, atque eis, quid eminus ipse videret, ostendit. Tum abire eos et comprehensos ad se perducere omnes pueros imperat. Quumque adessent, quis eis ludus, et quid egissent, vel quomodo, percunctatur. Illi, ut talis habet ætas, pavidi, negare primo, deinde rem gestam per ordinem pandunt, et baptizatos a se esse quosdam catechumenos confitentur per Athanasium, qui ludi illius puerilis episcopus fuerat simulatus. Tum ille diligenter inquirens ab his, qui baptizati dicebantur, quid interrogati fuerint quidve responderint, simul et ab eo, qui interrogaverat. Ubi videt, secundum religionis nostræ ritum cuncta cōnstare, conlocutus cum concilio clericorum, statuisse traditur, illis, quibus integris interrogationibus et responsionibus aqua fuerit infusa, iterari baptismum non debere, sed adimpleri ea quæ a sacerdotibus mos est.

[h] Socrat. Hist. lib. i. c. xv. tot.
[i] Sozomen. lib. ii. c. xvii.
[k] Phot. Cod. cclviii. pp. 1429, 1430.
[l] Mosch. Pratum Spirit. c. cxcvii.

Digitized by Google

it is some confirmation, that Ruffin says, he had it from the mouth of those who conversed with Athanasius. And Nicephorus Callistus, who also relates the story,[m] gives a parallel instance of another fact much like this, which happened in his own time at Constantinople: which shews it not to be altogether so singular and incredible a case as some are apt to imagine. But admit it were a fabulous report, yet we must charitably believe of the ancient historians, both Greek and Latin, that they believed themselves, at least, what they reported, that such a fact had happened at Alexandria; and if it had been contrary to the general sense and practice of the Church in their times, they would hardly have related it so plausibly, without passing some censure and reflection on it, as some modern Greeks have done; who like not the thing, and therefore censure it, not as a fabulous story, but an irregular action: which the ancient historians having not done, it may reasonably be concluded, that, at least, they thought the determination of Alexander and his council to be agreeable to the general sense and practice of the Church. But there is another exception made to this case by Matthew Blastares, a modern Greek canonist, who says,[n] "It was only a single example, and done against canon." Which is an answer that has more modesty, and in one part of it seems to carry more weight, in it, than either of the former: for I believe there is no canon that does antecedently authorize one youth, without necessity, to baptize another. But then he a little mistakes the question, which is not about the fact of Athanasius, but the determination of Alexander upon it: for as to the fact of Athanasius, any one will readily own, that there was neither canon nor precedent, perhaps, to warrant the doing of it; and it would be strange if any such canon should be made in the Church. But for the

[m] Niceph. Hist. lib. iii. c. xxxvii.

[n] Blastar. Syntagma c. apud Bever. Pandect. tom. ii. p. 43. *Ὥσπερ οἱ τῶν Ἀγαρηνῶν βαπτιζόμενοι παῖδες τῷ μὴ δυσωδίας ἀπόζειν, Χριστιανοὶ οὐ λογίζονται, οὕτως οὐδὲ οἱ μύρῳ χριόμενοι πρὸς τῶν ἀνιέρων· ὅτι μὴ δέδοται τοῖς τοιούτοις ἁγιασμοῦ τινος ὅλως μεταδιδόναι· εἰ δέ τις ἀνθυποφέρει τὸ παρὰ τοῦ μεγάλου Ἀθανασίου ἔτι παιδὸς ὄντος γεγονὸς, ἐνθυμηθήτω τὸν Θεσπίζοντα πολιτικὸν νόμον, ὅτι τὸ παρὰ κανόνας οὔχ ἵλκεται εἰς ὑπόδειγμα. Καὶ οὐ νόμος ἐκκλησίας τὸ σπάνιον.*

Digitized by Google

determination of Alexander, that a baptism given in due form, though irregularly, by the hand of a layman, may be so valid as not to need repeating; I believe it will not be so easy a matter, as Blastares imagined, to produce an ancient canon directly to confront it, by declaring that such irregular baptisms are utterly null and void, though they have the postnate allowance of the Church where they are done, which was the peculiar circumstance of the present case: for there seem to be two ways of allowing any act, either by an antecedent authority given to a man to perform it, or by a subsequent confirmation of the thing when done irregularly, and without authority, which is, *ex post facto*, an allowance of it. And thus, it is plain, the baptisms, given by Athanasius, were allowed and confirmed by Alexander in the Church.

## SECT. XI.— *Of St. Jerome.*

In the latter end of the fourth century lived St. Jerome and St. Austin, who have both spoken very plainly of the practice of the Church, as to what concerns the allowance of lay-baptism in some certain cases. St. Jerome, as has been observed before, derives the power of presbyters and deacons to baptize from the original power of the bishop; yet, in cases of necessity, he says,[o] it was also allowed frequently to laymen: for, in such cases, he that had received baptism, might give it to others. This testimony of St. Jerome is so full and plain, that I have often wondered how so learned and acute a man as Dr. Forbes,[p] and the ingenious Mr. Reeves,[q] could run into such a mistake as to say, "That after the Council of Nice, this proposition, that those whom

[o] Hieron. Dial. cont. Lucifer. c. iv. Sine chrismate et jussione episcopi neque presbyter neque diaconus jus habent baptizandi. Quod frequenter (si tamen necessitas cogit) scimus etiam licere laicis. Ut enim accipit quis, ita et dare potest.

[p] Forbes. Instruct. Histor. lib. x. c. xiv. n. v. Usque adeo autem apud orthodoxos etiam post Nicænum Concilium major ille propositio: 'Quos baptizavit laicus, ii sunt denuo baptizandi,' n. iv.) firmitatem obtinuit, ut ea, tamquam indubitato principio, errorem Luciferi confutarint.

[q] Reeves, Not. ad Vincent. Lirin. p. 263.

Digitized by Google

a laic baptizeth are to be rebaptized, was looked upon to be so true, that it was the undoubted principle, whereby the orthodox confuted the Luciferians." Who that reads these words in these learned writers, and looks no further, would not at first sight be tempted to think, that the Council of Nice had somewhere made an order, that persons baptized by laymen should be rebaptized; and that the Catholics generally made use of this as an undoubted principle to confute the Luciferians? And yet, in fact, there was no such thing. The Council of Nice never made any decree about the rebaptization of persons baptized by laymen, but only by heretical priests: nor did the Catholics use that proposition as an undoubted principle against the Luciferians. St. Jerome wrote against the Luciferians; but he is so far from asserting, universally, that those whom a laic baptizeth are to be rebaptized, that he expressly maintains the contrary, that, if necessity required, laymen had liberty granted them to baptize. Mr. Reeves has once done me the honour to let my opinion and judgment be of some esteem with him; and I believe when he considers this matter again, he will see reason to alter his opinion in this particular, being as ingenuous as he is learned; and the rather, because the world is apt to be led into error by persons of note and authority, and to take things upon trust when delivered to them by men of a superior character. If there had not been this fear, I could not have prevailed with myself to have noted this mistake in a person, for whose useful labours I have so great a veneration.

## SECT. XII. — *Of St. Austin.*

St. Austin was contemporary with St. Jerome, and of the same opinion with him in this matter. In his epistle to Fortunatus, which is preserved in Gratian, he says,[r] "In

[r] Apud Gratian. de Consecrat. Dist. iv. c. xxi. In necessitate, quum episcopi, aut presbyteri, aut quilibet ministrorum non inveniuntur, et urget periculum ejus qui petit, ne sine isto sacramento hanc vitam finiat, etiam laicos solere dare sacramentum quod acceperunt, solemus audire.

Digitized by Google

time of necessity, when a bishop, or a presbyter, or other minister, could not be found, and a man desired baptism who was in danger of death; in that case laymen were used to give him that sacrament which they had received, rather than he should end his life without it." And this custom he founds upon authority descended by bishops from the apostles: for in the same epistle he says,[s] "Baptism is holy in itself, if it be given in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: and there is in this sacrament the authority of the commission which our Saviour gave to the apostles, and by them to the bishops, and other priests, and even to laymen descending from the same stock and original." He there also relates a story of a certain catechumen, who being at sea, and in danger of being cast away in a storm, was baptized by a penitent, because there was no other Christian in the ship with them. And he concludes upon it, that though such a fact had not happened, yet it was a case that every one must own might happen; and then no one could say, that in such a case a man who desired baptism in imminent danger of death, was to be deserted, and left unbaptized. But if any one thinks these passages doubtful, because they are only related by Gratian, he may read the same in St. Austin's undoubted works. In his books against Parmenian, the Donatist, he uses this argument to prove that the baptism of heretics ought not to be repeated:[t] "Because, though it be but a layman that gives baptism to a man in extreme necessity, when he is ready to perish, he cannot think any one can piously say that it ought to be repeated. If it be done without necessity, it is indeed an usurpation of

[s] Apud Gratian. de Consecrat. Dist. iv. c. xxxvi. Sanctum est baptisma per se ipsum, quod datum est, in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti: ita ut in eodem sacramento sit etiam auctoritas traditionis per Dominum nostrum ad apostolos, per illos autem ad episcopos et alios sacerdotes, vel etiam laicos Christianos, ab eadem origine et stirpe venientes.—Ibid. Non potest quisquam dicere, relinquendum esse illum, qui morte imminente baptizari desiderat. Quem baptizatum a pœnitente quisquis non credat contigisse, oportet ut credat posse contingere.

[t] Aug. cont. ep. Parmen. lib. ii. c. xiii. (Bened. 1700, vol. ix. p. 29, F. 3.) Si laicus aliquis pereunti dederit, necessitate compulsus, quod quum ipse acciperet, dandum quomodo esse addidicit, nescio an pie quisquam dixerit esse repetendum. Nulla enim cogente necessitate si fiat, alieni muneris usurpatio est: si autem necessitas urgeat, aut nullum aut veniale delictum est.

Digitized by Google

another man's office: but if he be compelled by necessity, it is either no fault at all, or but a very light one."

### SECT. XIII. — *Of Gelasius* (*an.* 492).

The next writer after St. Austin who has said any thing of this matter, is Gelasius, bishop of Rome, who, in his epistle to the bishops of Lucania, Brutia, and Sicily,[u] restrains the office of baptizing in ordinary cases to bishops and presbyters only; excluding deacons from it, except in cases of extreme necessity, when the superior ministers were absent: in which cases it was often allowed to lay-Christians to perform it. So that laymen had as much authority to perform it, in the absence of deacons, as deacons had to do it in the absence of the presbyters and bishop.

### SECT. XIV. — *Of Isidore, Bishop of Seville* (*an.* 595).

Isidore, bishop of Seville, lived about a hundred years after Gelasius, and he delivers himself to the same effect:[w] "That it is unlawful either for private men, or the inferior clergy, to baptize; for the office belongs only to priests. We read in the Gospel, that it was given by commission to no other but the apostles; Jesus, after his resurrection, saying unto them, 'As my Father hath sent me, so send I you.' And when he had said this, he breathed on them, saying, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever

[u] Gelas. Epist. ix. ad Episc. Lucan. c. viii. (Labbé, vol. iv. p. 1190.) Absque episcopo vel presbytero baptizare non audeant diaconi: nisi, prædictis fortasse officiis longius constitutis necessitas extrema compellat: quod et laicis Christianis facere plerumque conceditur.

[w] Isidor. de Offic. Eccles. lib. ii. c. xxiv. Quod nec privatis nec clericis sine gradu baptizare liceat, nisi tantum sacerdotibus: in evangelio legimus, apostolis tantum premissum, Jesu post resurrectionem dicente, "'Sicut me misit Pater, et ego mitto vos.' Et hoc quum dixisset, insufflavit et ait eis, 'Accipite Spiritum Sanctum. Quorum remiseritis peccata, remittentur eis; et quorum retinueritis, retenta erunt.' Et in alio loco, 'Ite, docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.'" Unde constat, baptismum solis sacerdotibus esse traditum, ejusque mysterium nec ipsis diaconibus explere est licitum absque episcopis vel presbyteris; nisi illis absentibus ultima languoris cogat necessitas: quod et laicis fidelibus plerumque permittitur, ne quisquam sine remedio salutari de sæculo evocetur.

Digitized by Google

sins ye retain, they are retained.' And in another place, 'Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' Whence it is manifest, that the ministry of baptism was committed only to priests; nor is it lawful for deacons themselves to perform the mystery without a bishop or a presbyter, except in their absence the extreme necessity of sickness compel them to do it: in which case also lay-Christians are often permitted to do it, lest any one should be called out of the world without the remedy or means of salvation." Thus we have seen for six hundred years the general sense and practice of the ancient Church, grounded, as they suppose, upon the commission given to the apostles; whereby bishops, as the apostles' successors, are qualified, first, to give baptism themselves, and then to grant a commission to others to baptize: and that either to presbyters and deacons, or to presbyters alone, in ordinary cases; and in cases extraordinary, and of extreme necessity, to deacons and laymen.

### SECT. XV. — *The Objection from St. Chrysostom, Basil, and Cyprian, answered.*

To this general consent of antiquity, Dr. Forbes,[x] and some others who follow him, have opposed the testimony of St. Chrysostom, St. Basil, and St. Cyprian; whose evidence, if it were entirely on the objector's side, would not weigh very much, because it would be only their private sense, and not the practice of the Church, which is the subject of the present inquiry. But I have shewed before (sect. v.), that St. Chrysostom's meaning is utterly mistaken by Dr. Forbes: for when Chrysostom confines the office of baptism to the hands of a priest, he only means in ordinary cases; otherwise deacons, who are no priests, would be absolutely excluded from it in all cases whatsoever, as well as laymen: and yet Chrysostom allows deacons to baptize in cases of necessity; which makes it evident, that his discourse only relates to the ministration of baptism in ordinary cases. I

[x] Forbes. Instruct. lib. x. c. xiv. Chrysostomus, non obstante necessitate, baptismum solis vindicat sacerdotibus, 'Manifesta,' inquit, 'dementia est,' &c.

Digitized by Google

do not here repeat St. Chrysostom's words, because the reader may find them alleged above, in speaking of the power of deacons. As to St. Basil, it will be readily owned that he had somewhat of a singular opinion in this matter: for he was for rebaptizing all persons that were only baptized by laymen, as he was also for rebaptizing all that were baptized by heretical and schismatical priests; for he brings in Cyprian and Firmilian (his predecessor in the see of Cæsarea) arguing after this manner:[y] "Heretics and schismatics are broken off from the Church, and become laymen; and therefore have no power to baptize or to ordain, being no longer able to give the gift of the Holy Ghost to others, which they have lost themselves: therefore such as are baptized by them, when they return to the Church, are to be rebaptized with the true baptism of the Church, as being only baptized by laymen." If it were not for St. Basil's testimony, I should doubt whether Cyprian had ever made use of such an argument as this. 1. Because no such argument, that I know of, is to be found in his works. 2. Because Tertullian, whom Cyprian commonly called his master, made a great distinction between the baptism of heretics and the baptism of Catholic laymen, at least in cases of necessity, as we have seen before: for he was against rebaptizing those that were so baptized by laymen, though he was as much for rebaptizing those that were baptized by heretics,[z] as Cyprian himself. 3. Cyprian always paid a far greater deference to Catholic laymen than he did to heretical priests; as esteeming the one members of the Church, and the other quite cut off from it: he admitted the one into his councils, and did nothing without their consent in many ecclesiastical causes: but the other he abandoned and abhorred, as men that had abandoned the faith, and renounced their Christianity by their heretical doctrine. These are probable arguments to

[y] Basil. Epist. ad Amphiloch. c. i. (Paris. 1638, vol. iii. p. 21, C.) Οἱ δὲ ἀποῤῥαγέντες, λαϊκοὶ γενόμενοι, οὔτε τοῦ βαπτίζειν, οὔτε τοῦ χειροτονεῖν εἶχον ἐξουσίαν, οὐκέτι δυνάμενοι χάριν Πνεύματος ἁγίου ἑτέροις παρέχειν, ἧς αὐτοὶ ἐκπεπτώκασι. Διὸ ὡς παρὰ λαϊκῶν βαπτιζομένους τοὺς παρ' αὐτῶν ἐκέλευσαν ἐρχομένους ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, τῷ ἀληθινῷ βαπτίσματι, τῷ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀναπαθαίρεσθαι.

[z] Tertul. de Bapt. c. xv. tot. (Paris. 1664, p. 230.)

Digitized by Google

incline a man to think, that Cyprian was of the same mind with his master, Tertullian, as to the point of lay-baptism, had not St. Basil's authority been against them. But, however this matter was, St. Basil was not so stiff to this opinion, and the particular practice of his own Church, as to unchristian those that were baptized by schismatics, or break the communion of the Church upon it: for he gives his advice in the words immediately following, "That men should quietly comply with the rules and practice of their own Church, where they lived. But forasmuch," says he,[a] "as some of the Asiatic Churches think otherwise, that the baptism of such, by way of dispensation, for the sake of great multitudes, ought to be received — let it be received." Whence, I think, it may be inferred, that though St. Basil, in his own opinion, did not approve of the baptism either of schismatics or laymen, yet he thought it might stand good, if the Church thought fit to receive and confirm it: and this he seems to assert, upon the common principle of the ancients, that a latitude of power was left with the rulers and governors of the Church to ratify such baptisms, when they found it necessary for the benefit and edification of the Church. But, if otherwise, St. Basil's opinion, or St. Cyprian's, cannot prejudice the contrary doctrine, or be thrown into the balance against the common consent and practice of the Church. And yet it may be observed, that St. Basil speaks, perhaps, not of lay-baptism in cases of necessity, but of usurping the office, as heretics did in ordinary cases: which makes a wide difference in the case, and belongs to a more difficult question; that is, Whether unauthorized baptisms were ever ratified and made good by the subsequent confirmation and reception of the Church? Which is the next point that comes now in order to be considered.

[a] Basil. Epist. ad Amphiloch. c. i. (Labbé, vol. iii. p. 21, C. 6.) Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ὅλως ἴδιόν τισι τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν οἰκονομίας ἕνεκα τῶν πολλῶν, δεχθῆναι αὐτῶν τὸ βάπτισμα, ἔστω δεκτόν.

Digitized by Google

## SECT. XVI.—*Whether the usurped and unauthorized Baptism of Laymen was allowed to be valid.*

This question, as I said, has much more difficulty than the former: because a great many of the authors, who have justified the lawfulness of lay-baptism in cases of necessity, are wholly silent upon this point: for neither Tertullian, nor the Council of Eliberis, nor St. Jerome, nor Gelasius, nor Isidore, have said any thing upon it; they only consider the case of necessity, and no other. And the author of the Apostolical Constitutions seems to pronounce severely of usurped and unauthorized actions, as utterly null and void. He has a whole chapter with this title, "That it is a horrible thing for a man to thrust himself into the priest's dignity or office, as the Korahites, and Saul, and Uzzias did;" and he thus expresses himself upon it:[b] "As it was not lawful for a stranger, that was not of the tribe of Levi, to offer any thing, or approach the altar without a priest, so do ye nothing without the bishop: for if any man does any thing without the bishop, he does it in vain: it shall not be reputed to him as any service. As Saul, when he had offered sacrifice without Samuel, was told that he had done vainly; so whatever layman does any thing without a priest, he labours in vain. And as King Uzzias, when he had invaded the priest's office, was smitten with leprosy for his transgression; so every layman shall bear his punishment that contemns God, and insults his priests, and takes honour to himself, not imitating Christ, who glorified not himself, but stayed

[b] Constitut. Apost. lib. ii. c. xxvii. (Labbé, vol. i. p. 264, D.) Ὅτι φρικῶδες ἄνθρωπον ἑαυτὸν ἐπιῤῥίπτειν ἀξιώματί τινι ἱερατικῷ· ὡς οἱ Κορεῖται, ὡς Σαοὺλ, ὡς Ὀζίας. Ὡς οὐκ ἦν ἐξὸν ἀλλογενῆ, μὴ ὄντα Λευίτην, προσενίγκαί τι, ἢ προσελθεῖν εἰς τὸ θυσιαστήριον, ἄνευ τοῦ ἱερέως, οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ἄνευ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν ποιεῖτε. Εἰ δέ τις ἄνευ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου ποιεῖ τι, εἰς μάτην ποιεῖ αὐτό· οὐ γὰρ αὐτῷ εἰς ἔργον λογισθήσεται. Ὡς γὰρ ὁ Σαοὺλ ἄνευ τοῦ Σαμουὴλ προσενίγκας, ἠκουσεν ὅτι Μεματαίωται σοι· οὕτω καὶ πᾶς λαϊκὸς ἄνευ τοῦ ἱερέως ἐπιτελῶν τι, μάταια ποιεῖ· καὶ ὡς Ὀζίας ὁ βασιλεὺς οὐκ ὢν ἱερεὺς τὰ τῶν ἱερέων ἐπιτελῶν ἐλεπρώθη διὰ παρανομίαν, οὕτω καὶ πᾶς λαϊκὸς οὐκ ἀτιμώρητος ἔσται, καταφρονήσας Θεοῦ, καὶ τῶν αὐτοῦ καταμανεὶς ἱερέων, καὶ τὴν τιμὴν ἁρπάσας ἑαυτῷ, μὴ μιμησάμενος Χριστὸν, ὃς οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδόξασε γενηθῆναι ἀρχιερέα, ἀλλὰ περιέμεινεν ἀκοῦσαι τοῦ Πατρός· Ὤμοσε Κύριος, καὶ οὐ μεταμεληθήσεται· σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ.

Digitized by Google

till his Father said, 'Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedek.'" Now this discourse, when applied to baptism, will amount to this, that every one who usurps the office of baptizing, which belongs not to him, is a great transgressor in the sight of God, and all his acts are vain, as to what concerns himself: for they shall never be accounted to him as acceptable service, worthy of a reward, but rather inevitably make him liable to wrath and punishment. But still the question remains, Whether such acts, though vain in respect of the administrator, be utterly vain and void in respect of the receiver also? And as this author has not precisely determined this point, so I will not pretend to determine it for him. On the other hand, the determination that was given by Alexander and the Church of Alexandria, is plain, that such baptisms, though unauthorized and very irregular in the administrator, are not wholly null and void as to the effect in the party baptized. Athanasius, it is certain, could have no law of the Church to authorize him to baptize in that case and manner in which he performed it; and yet Alexander would not suffer those to be rebaptized, who had been so baptized by him. St. Austin was of the same judgment: he freely owns, that when baptism is performed by a layman, without necessity, it is an usurpation of another man's office:—but yet, he thinks, it is not wholly null and void as to the receiver, but a true baptism, which ought not to be repeated. His words are these:[c] "Though it be usurped without necessity, and given by any man to another; that which is given, cannot be said not to be given, though it may be truly said to be

[c] Aug. cont. Parmen. lib. ii. c. xiii. (Bened. 1700, vol. ix. p. 29, F. 8.) Et si nulla necessitate usurpetur, et a quolibet cuilibet detur; quod datum fuerit non potest dici non datum, quamvis recte dici possit illicite datum. Illicitam ergo usurpationem corrigit reminiscentis et pœnitentis affectus. Quod si non correxerit, manebit ad pœnam usurpatoris quod datum est, vel ejus qui illicite dedit, vel ejus qui illicite accepit: non tamen pro non dato habebitur; neque ullo modo per devotum militem, quod a privatis usurpatum est, signum regale violabitur. Si enim aliqui furtim et extra ordinem, in monetis publicis aurum vel argentum, vel æs percutiendo signaverint; quum fuerit deprehensum, nonne illis punitis, aut indulgentia liberatis, cognitum regale signum thesauris regalibus congeretur?

Digitized by Google

unlawfully given: therefore the unlawful usurpation is to be corrected by a sincere and affectionate repentance; and, if it be not corrected, that which is given will remain to the punishment of the usurper, as well of him who gave it unlawfully, as of him who received it unlawfully; but yet it cannot be accounted as not given. No devout soldier ever violates the royal stamp, though it be usurped by private men: for though some by stealth, and in a clandestine way, set the royal stamp, not to the public money, but their own; yet the money so stamped, when they are either punished or pardoned for their offence, having the royal standard upon it, is not defaced, but brought into the king's treasury." Whence it is plain, he thought that baptism given by laymen in ordinary cases, which was an usurpation of the priest's office, was not to be repeated. And this he asserts in another place against the Donatists, yet not as the determination of any general council, but as his own opinion: for he says,[d] if he were a member of such a synod, wherein this question was debated, he should not scruple to assert all those to have baptism, wheresoever or by whomsoever baptized, that had received it in faith, and without dissimulation, in that form of words which is prescribed by the Gospel: though if they wanted charity, and were out of the Catholic Church, it would not profit them to salvation, or any other spiritual concerns.—Optatus was plainly of the same opinion: he thought that Christ gave a commission to his apostles to baptize, but yet not such an one as peremptorily annulled and evacuated all baptisms that were performed by any other. "Our Saviour," says he,[e] "gave commandment in whose name the nations should be

[d] Aug. de Bapt. lib. vii. c. liii. (Bened. 1700, vol. ix. p. 136, F. 2.) Nequaquam dubitarem habere eos baptismum, qui ubicumque et a quibuscumque illud verbis evangelicis consecratum, sine sua simulatione, et cum aliqua fide accepissent: quamquam eis ad salutem spiritualem non prodesset, si caritate caruissent, qua Catholicæ insererentur ecclesiæ.

[e] Optat. cont. Parmen. lib. v. p. 90. In quo baptizarentur gentes, a Salvatore mandatum est: per quem baptizarentur, nulla exceptione discretum est. Non dixit apostolis, Vos facite, alii non faciant. Quisquis in nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti baptizaverit, apostolorum opus implevit. . . . Ergo nomen est quod sanctificat, non opus. (Antuerp. 1702, p. 86, at bottom.)

Digitized by Google

baptized: but he did not determine, without exception, by whom they should be baptized. He said not to his disciples, 'This shall ye do, and no other shall do it:' for whoever baptizes in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, fulfils the work of the apostles." Then he alleges that saying of St. John the apostle, in the Gospel, "Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and we forbade him, because he followeth not with us." To which Christ replied, "Forbid him not; for he that is not against you, is for you." Upon which he concludes, that it was the name of the Trinity, and not the work of the agent, that sanctifies the mystery, and that the ministers of baptism were only labourers, and not lords of the action. And upon this ground he allows the baptism of schismatics, and such heretics also as baptized in the faith of the Trinity, to be valid, though they were not every way legally authorized and qualified, as the true ministers of the Church, to perform it: of which more hereafter, in its proper place.

## SECT. XVII. — *Of the Baptism of Women, whether they had any Authority to Baptize.*

The next question is concerning the baptism of women, Whether they had any authority, or were ever allowed in any case, to baptize in the Church? As to ordinary cases, it is agreed on all hands, that they were absolutely forbidden to meddle with any ecclesiastical office, and baptism in particular. This was the controversy between the Church and several ancient heresies, Whether women might be priests, and baptize as well as men? The Marcionites affirmed it to be lawful; so did the Collyridians, and the Pepuzians, and Cataphrygians, which were a branch of the Montanists. But the Catholics, with great vehemence, always opposed this, as an illegal and unchristian practice: as I have had occasion to shew more at large in another work, where I discoursed of the office of the deaconnesses in the ancient Church, to which I refer the reader.[f] The Lutherans and the Romanists, who defend the baptism of women in cases of extreme necessity,

[f] Origin. Eccles. book ii. chap. xxii. sect. vii. vol. i.



Digitized by Google

do not deny this; but say their adversaries do them wrong to charge them with the practice of the Marcionites and Montanists, which they utterly disavow. Therefore, the stress of the question lies in this, Whether the ancient Church allowed women to baptize in extraordinary cases of extreme necessity, as she did laymen? And here, I think, with submission to better judgments, she did not. For Tertullian, in the very same place where he grants it may lawfully be done by men, forbids it absolutely to be done by women: and he goes upon this principle, that men were called to the sacerdotal office, but not women; and, therefore, when any exigency required, the one might perform it, but not the other. He calls it petulancy in women to usurp the power of baptizing.[g] And whereas some defended it by the example of Tecla, and urged the authority of that ancient writing which was called the Acts of Paul and Tecla, and was supposed to be written by the apostle himself; he gives them to understand that it was no such thing, but that it was written by a presbyter in Asia, under the name of St. Paul; and that the presbyter was convict of the matter, and confessed the thing, that he did it out of love to St. Paul; but he was deposed notwithstanding for his forgery. For it was utterly improbable that the apostle should grant women a power to teach and baptize, who did not so much as allow them to ask questions for learning's sake in a public assembly.—In another place he says,[h] "It was not permitted to women to speak in the Church: but neither might they teach, nor baptize, nor offer the oblation, nor assume to themselves any office belonging to men, much less those that appertained to the priests only."

[g] Tertul. de Bapt. c. xvii. (Paris. 1664, p. 231, B.) Petulantia autem mulieris quæ usurpavit docere, utique non etiam tingendi jus sibi pariet: ut quemadmodum illa baptismum auferebat, ita aliqua per se eum conferat. Quod si quæ Paulo perperam adscripta sunt [Pauli perperam scripta legunt, exemplum Teclæ], ad licentiam mulierum docendi tingendique defendunt; sciant in Asia presbyterum, qui eam scripturam construxit, quasi titulo Pauli de suo cumulans, convictum atque confessum id se amore Pauli fecisse, loco decessisse. Quam enim fidei proximum videretur, ut is docendi et tingendi daret feminæ potestatem, qui ne discere quidem constanter mulieri permisit?

[h] Ibid. de Veland. Virgin. c. ix. (Paris. 1664, p. 178, A.) Non permittitur mulieri in ecclesia loqui; sed nec docere, nec tingere, nec offerre, nec ullius virilis muneris, nedum sacerdotalis officii, sortem sibi vindicare.

Digitized by Google

Whence it seems pretty plain, that he did not allow the same power and authority to women to baptize in cases of necessity, as he did to men, since he makes an exception in the one case, but none in the other. And so in the fourth Council of Carthage,[i] women are absolutely forbidden to baptize, without any exception. For though Gratian and and Peter Lombard add the words *nisi necessitate cogente*, 'except necessity require,' to the ancient body of that canon; yet this is either an interpretation of their own, or else a plain fraud: for there is no such reading now in any tome of the Councils; and as Vossius observes,[k] it is otherwise cited by Walafridus Strabo[l] some ages before them; which is an argument that the former is the genuine reading, and that the canon originally had no such exception. Nor does St. Jerome, nor St. Austin, nor Gelasius, nor Isidore, grant any authority to women to baptize, as they do to men. Whence it may be inferred from their silence, that they did not think their cases to be parallel. And it may be concluded further, that the practice and rules of the modern Greek Church, and Romanists, and Lutherans, which allow midwives, or any other women, to baptize in cases of necessity, whatever other grounds they may have to go upon, are not to be justified from the rules and canons of the ancient Church, since there are no such to authorize the practice.

[i] Conc. Carth. IV. can. c. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 1207.) Mulier baptizare non præsumat.

[k] Voss. de Bapt. Disput. n. xv. p. 148. Juniores (Lombardus et Gratianus) hæc verba adjungunt, 'nisi necessitate cogente.' Unde Pamelius ad Tertullianum (libro de Baptismo, c. xvii.) jam olim sic lectum fuisse concludit. Sed quum, uti dixi, nec Walafridus ea legerit verba, nec hodie ea lectio in ullis reperiatur conciliorum libris; magis sit verisimile, Lombardum illa ac Gratianum adjecisse, tamquam canonis interpretamentum.

[l] Strabo de Offic. c. xxvi. In hoc et similibus non tribuitur quibuscunque baptizandi indiscreta licentia, quum Concilio Carthaginensi mulieres prohibeantur baptizare.

Digitized by Google

SECT. XVIII.— *Whether the usurped Baptism of Women was esteemed valid?*

But it will be demanded further, Whether if women usurped the authority of baptizing, either in ordinary cases, as the heretical priestesses did; or in extraordinary cases of necessity, as perhaps some might do in the Catholic Church, though against law; was their baptism repeated as null and void, or received as valid by the Church? This question, consisting of several parts, I cannot give the same distinct and positive answer to each part of it. But I think there is no doubt to be made, but that, first, All such Churches as rejected the baptism of heretical men, must needs be supposed to have rejected the baptism of heretical women, whether in ordinary or extraordinary cases. Therefore, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Firmilian,[m] are plain in the case, that all such baptisms are invalid. I think it also probable, that they who received the baptism of heretical men out of the Church as valid—and the baptism of Catholic laymen in the Church, as not only valid, but authorized too—did yet reject the baptism of women in both cases; because they are so peremptory in prohibiting women universally to meddle with the ministerial offices, and this always without exception of any cases whatsoever. But as I remember no ancient author that has spoken directly and closely to this part of the question; and there are some reasons to incline a man to believe St. Austin to have been of a different opinion; so I leave this to the judgment of others, and further inquiry.

SECT. XIX.— *Whether Heretical and Schismatical Priests, and Degraded Clergymen, had any legal Authority to Baptize?*

The next thing in debate is, concerning baptism administered by heretical and schismatical bishops, priests, and deacons, and such of the Catholic clergy as are legally degraded or deposed by the authority of the Church, for transgressing the rules of their function. The particular stating and examination of this matter is a thing of great

[m] Firmil. Epist. lxxv. apud Cyprian. (Oxon. 1682, p. 223, tot.)

Digitized by Google

weight and moment; because it is such a practical case as the Church has always been much more concerned in, than in that of the baptism of mere laymen. And the whole Church of England, and all the Churches of the Reformation, have the very essence and being of their baptism and Christianity depending on it. For they all received their baptism from the heretical and schismatical Church of Rome. According, therefore, as heretical and schismatical baptism is determined to be valid or not valid, such must be the fate of these Churches, either to have received true and valid baptism, or else to want yet all of them to be rebaptized. Now, that I may speak the sense of the ancient Church upon this grand point with clearness and distinction, it will be necessary to treat separately of these four questions: 1. Whether heretics and schismatics have any legal authority from the Church to baptize? 2. Whether, supposing them to have no legal authority, their baptism be notwithstanding true and valid baptism? 3. What privileges are conferred by such baptism, what are its defects, and how those deficiencies were supplied upon men's returning to the unity of the holy Catholic Church? 4. Whether heretics, and schismatics, and degraded clergymen, act in that capacity as clergymen or laymen? The distinct consideration of these several questions will be of great use: for nothing has more embroiled the Church, or confounded men in this dispute, than the not distinguishing authorized baptism from that which is merely valid; and the privileges and perfections of the one from the deficiencies and imperfections of the other. It was the not attending to these things distinctly, that led Cyprian and all his associates into the error of rebaptization. They thought no baptism could be valid, unless both the administrator was an authorized person, and his baptism could also exhibit all those spiritual graces which are ordinarily the effects of Catholic baptism: but both these things were wanting in the baptism of heretics, viz. both authority and spiritual graces; and therefore they concluded their baptism to be invalid. It is the same want of attending to the distinction between unauthorized baptism and invalid baptism, which leads many into a mistake at this day. They

Digitized by Google

always confound these two things together, which yet are of very different consideration from each other: for all the baptisms of heretics, schismatics, and degraded ministers, are unauthorized; and yet it will not be safe to conclude immediately that they are therefore absolutely invalid: otherwise the Catholic Church and the Church of England were in an ill case, as will appear by the sequel of this discourse.

For, first of all, it was agreed on all hands, that heretics, and schismatics, and degraded clergymen, had not any legal authority from the Church to baptize. This was not only asserted by Cyprian and his followers, who maintained the invalidity of such baptisms, but also by St. Austin, and all the rest that stood up for the validity of them against the necessity of rebaptizing. And they went upon this ground, that they who deserted and opposed the Church, were thenceforth destitute of her lawful call, and therefore acted not only without her authority, but against her authority in all their ministrations. They were so far from having the Church's authority to baptize in such cases, that they incurred her severest censures and anathemas for doing it, although their baptisms were received as valid under such an irregular and unlawful administration. Nothing can be plainer than that canon of the second Council of Carthage to this purpose, which says,[n] "That if a presbyter, who is under the censure or excommunication of his own bishop, would have any redress, he must apply himself to the neighbouring bishops, and have his cause heard by them, in order to be reconciled to his bishop. But if he refuses to do this, and proudly withdrawing himself from the communion of his bishop, he sets up a separate and schismatical meeting to offer sacrifice to God, let him be an anathema and lose his place." If such a schismatical presbyter makes himself an anathema for ministering the sacrament in a separate meeting, however valid in themselves his sacraments may be, yet

[n] Conc. Carth. II. c. viii. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 1161, D. 8.) Si quis presbyter a præposito suo excommunicatus vel correptus fuerit, debet utique apud vicinos episcopos conqueri, ut ab ipsis ejus causa possit audiri, ac per ipsos suo episcopo reconciliari. Quod nisi fecerit, sed superbia (quod absit), inflatus secernendum se ab episcopi sui communione duxerit, ac separatim cum aliquibus schisma faciens, sacrificium Dei obtulerit, anathema habeatur, et locum amittat.

Digitized by Google

certainly he acts against the authority of the Church, and all his ministrations are sinful and unlawful in such a separation. This is what we have heard Ignatius declare before :[o] "That it is not lawful either to baptize or celebrate the eucharist without the bishop; but what he allows, is well-pleasing to God." Now, what should make it sinful and displeasing to God for a presbyter to baptize without his bishop, but only that in so doing he acts without and against the authority of his bishop, and in opposition to him whom God has made the chief governor of the Church? This is also what we have heard St. Jerome say before,[p] "That neither presbyters nor deacons have any right to baptize without the order or authority of their bishop, because he is the chief minister of the Church." But enough has been said already upon this point, in speaking of the bishops' original power, and of the power of presbyters and deacons, as only derivative from them, to shew that none can have any lawful authority or regular power to baptize, but only as they act in subordination to them, according to the standing laws and rules of the Catholic Church. Only here we must observe a distinction which St. Austin makes about the word 'power:' which either signifies that regular authority and power of administering baptism in a lawful way, which we have been speaking of; or else such a power as may be in men to give a baptism that shall stand valid and firm, though they were not regularly qualified to perform it, but did it by contradiction to known rules, and in manifest usurpation. In which sense he allows heretics, and schismatics, and contumacious or degraded bishops and priests, to have still a power to baptize. But then this was not the true, regular, authorized baptism of the Church, but an usurped power, and invasion of an office which regularly belonged to others. So that there was no dispute among the ancients upon this point; for they all agreed in this, that taking power only for regular power, and just and lawful authority, heretics, and schismatics, and degraded priests, had not lawful authority to baptize; but what they did was done (properly speaking) by

[o] Ignat. Epist. ad Smyrn. n. viii. See above, sect. iii. note (f), p. 18.

[p] Hieron. Dial. adv. Lucifer. c. iv. See before, sect. iii. note (m), p. 19.

Digitized by Google

an unauthorized, criminal, anti-episcopal usurpation, because contrary to the known rules and orders of the true governing part of the Catholic Church.

### SECT. XX. — *Whether the Baptism of Heretics and Schismatics was valid?*

But now, notwithstanding their agreement upon this point, that the baptism of heretics and schismatics was unauthorized and unlawful, they were divided upon the next question, about the validity of such baptisms. Tertullian, though he allowed the lawfulness and validity of the baptism of laymen in cases of necessity, yet he utterly rejected the baptism of heretics, simply and universally, as altogether null and void: for he says,[q] "There is but one baptism delivered to us either in the Gospel of Christ, or the writings of the apostles; because there is but one Lord and one baptism, and one Church in heaven. Upon which account it is proper to consider what is to be observed in relation to heretics: for the thing is only given in command to us: but heretics have no part or fellowship in our discipline; their very breach of communion testifies them to be foreigners: therefore I ought not to acknowledge that in them, which is only commanded to me; because we and they have not the same God, nor the same Christ; and consequently not one and the same baptism: which seeing they have not rightfully, they have it not at all. That which is not, cannot come into any account; nor can they be said to receive that which they have not." He says also he wrote a book in Greek particularly to this purpose. And he touches upon it in his

[q] Tertul. de Bapt. c. xv. (Paris. 1664, p. 230, A. 3.) Unus omnino baptismus est nobis, tam ex Domini evangelio, quam ex apostoli litteris: quoniam unus Deus, et unum baptisma, et una ecclesia in cœlis. Sed circa hæreticos sane quid custodiendum sit, digne quis retractet. Ad nos enim editum est. Hæretici autem nullum habent consortium nostræ disciplinæ, quos extraneos utique testatur ipsa ademtio communicationis. Non debeo in illis cognoscere quod mihi est præceptum; quia non idem Deus est nobis et illis; nec unus Christus, id est, idem: ideoque nec baptismus unus, quia non idem, quem quum rite non habeant, sine dubio non habent: nec capit numerari, quod non habetur. Ita nec possunt accipere, quia non habent. Sed de isto plenius jam nobis in Græco digestum est.

Digitized by Google

book of Prescriptions against Heretics, where he says,[r] "No man can be edified by him by whom he is destroyed. No man can be illuminated by him of whom he is led into darkness." And in another book he tells us more expressly,[s] "That heretics were received again by baptism, in the same manner as heathens were." Some think Tertullian here speaks of the school of Montanus, because he wrote his book *de Pudicitia*, when he was a Montanist: but his other books were written by him whilst he was a Catholic; and therefore I rather think he spake the sense of the Church of Carthage, and perhaps the whole African Church in those days. For Agrippinus, bishop of Carthage, with a synod of the provinces of Africa and Numidia, not long after confirmed the same thing, as we learn from Cyprian's epistles:[t] and the opinion of Cyprian,[u] and the several Councils of Carthage[w] in his

[r] Tertul. de Præscript. c. xii. (Paris. 1664, p. 206, D. 5.) Nemo inde instrui potest, unde destruitur. Nemo ab eo illuminatur, a quo contenebratur.

[s] Ibid. de Pudicit. c. xix. (Paris. 1664, p. 581, B.) Apud nos, ut ethnico par, immo et super ethnicum hæreticus etiam per baptisma veritatis utroque homine purgatus admittitur.

[t] Cyprian. Epist. lxxi. ad Quint. (Oxon. 1682, p. 193.) Retulit ad me, frater carissime, Lucianus, compresbyter noster, te desiderasse, ut significaremus tibi, quid sentiamus de his, qui apud hæreticos et schismaticos baptizati videntur. De qua re quid nuper in concilio plurimi coëpiscopi cum compresbyteris qui aderant, censuerimus, ut scires; ejusdem epistolæ exemplum tibi misi. Nescio etenim, qua præsumtione ducuntur quidam de collegis nostris, ut putent eos qui apud hæreticos tincti sunt, quando ad nos venerint, baptizari non oportere, eo quod dicant unum baptisma esse, quod unum scilicet in ecclesia Catholica est. Quæ ecclesia si una est, esse baptisma extra ecclesiam non potest. Nam quum duo baptismata esse non possunt, si hæretici vere baptizant, ipsi habent baptisma. Et qui hoc illis patrocinium de auctoritate sua præstat, cedit illis et consentit, ut hostes et adversarii Christi habere videantur abluendi, et purificandi, et sanctificandi hominis potestatem. Nos autem dicimus eos qui inde veniunt, non rebaptizari apud nos, sed baptizari. Neque enim accipiunt illic aliquid, ubi nihil est; sed veniunt ad nos, ut hic accipiant, ubi et gratia et veritas omnis est; quia et gratia et veritas una est. &c. — Ibid. Epist. lxxiii. ad Jubaian. p. 198. Scripsisti mihi, frater carissime, desiderans significari tibi motum animi nostri, quid nobis videatur de hæreticorum baptismo, qui, foris positi et extra ecclesiam constituti, vindicant sibi rem nec juris sui nec potestatis, quod nos nec ratum possumus, nec legitimum judicare, quando hoc apud eos esse constet illicitum. &c.

[u] Ibid. ep. lxix.–lxxiii. &c.

[w] Conc. Carth. ap. Cyprian. p. 229, (p. 158, seq. edit. Amstelod. 1700.) Epist. lxx. ad Januar. tot.

Digitized by Google

time, are so well known that I need not insist upon them. Firmilian, also, bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, joined with Cyprian, and wrote a long epistle to him[x] in defence of the same opinion, where he also mentions the decree of the synod of Iconium to the same purpose. Dionysius, also, bishop of Alexandria, maintained the same doctrine;[y] and, in one of his epistles, he alleges the decrees of the Councils of Iconium and Synada for confirmation of it. On the other hand, Stephen, bishop of Rome, and the Churches under him, stood up in defence of the contrary opinion. They asserted that all who were baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity, were to be received only with imposition of hands, without rebaptizing, whatever heresies or schisms they came over from to the Catholic Church. For so Firmilian, in his epistle to Cyprian,[z] delivers their opinion with exactness and candour. I know, indeed, a great many learned persons, and among them Vossius, Blondel, and Bishop Pearson,[a] are of opinion that Stephen, bishop of Rome, in opposition to Cyprian's doctrine, fell inconsiderately into the opposite extreme, and asserted, that all persons baptized by heretics, whether in the name of the Trinity or otherwise, were to be received without distinction. But a great many things are said by the learned Pagi[b] to clear Stephen

[x] Firmil. ep. lxxv. apud Cyprian. p. 221.

[y] Dionys. apud Euseb. lib. vii. c. vii.

[z] Firmil. ep. lxxv. apud Cyprian. p. 221. Non putant quærendum esse, quis sit ille qui baptizaverit, eo quod qui baptizatus sit, gratiam consequi potuerit, invocata Trinitate nominum Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.

[a] Pearson. Annal. Cyprian. an. 256, n. iii. p. 54, (p. 42, edit. Amstelod. 1700.) Si Stephanum spectes, &c. See following note.

[b] Pagi, Critic. in Baron. an. 256, n. iv. (Antuerp. 1727, vol. i. p. 261.) Pearsonius existimat, Cypriani et Stephani Papæ sententiam universali propositione constasse: Si Stephanum spectes, omnes ab hæreticis quibuscumque baptizati, reversi ab hæresi, in ecclesia recipi debent sine legitimo baptismo: si Cyprianum spectes, nullus in aliqua hæresi aut schismate primo baptizatus, ab hæresi aut schismate reversus, sine baptismo legitimo recipi debet: quæ Blondelli, immo et aliquorum Catholicorum sententia fuit. Existimarunt enim, Stephanum, damnando morem Cypriani et Africanorum antistitum, nec non Firmiliani et Orientalium de rebaptizandis hæreticis, in extremum errorem lapsum esse, ac decrevisse, quorumcumque hæreticorum baptisma, etiamsi consueta et solenni ecclesiæ forma et ritu collatum non esset, ratum esse ac legitimum, proindeque non iterandum. Verum hæc opinio improbabilis. Si enim in eum errorem lapsus

Digitized by Google

of this imputation, and, I think, with justice and reason; for this one passage of Firmilian (which yet has escaped the observation of learned men on both sides) does abundantly vindicate him from the charge; for it shews plainly, he was not for receiving the baptism of all heretics whatsoever, but such only as kept to the form of the Church, and baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity. And if there be any expressions in Stephen's letter to Cyprian, which seem to import more, they are candidly to be interpreted with this restriction and limitation. Which I observe for the sake of some late ingenious writers, who, depending upon the venerable authority of Bishop Pearson, have unwarily slid themselves, and led others, into the same mistaken opinion about Stephen, bishop of Rome; whereas Vincentius Lirinensis[c] fully vindicates his doctrine from the charge of novelty, and reckons it the true ancient Catholic opinion. Nor do I know any ancient writer that has passed any harder censure on him for it, except such as were professed abettors of Cyprian's opinions, however they might dislike his fierce and immoderate temper.

Thus, then, the controversy stood at first, about the rebaptization of heretics and schismatics. In the next age

fuisset Stephanus, universa ecclesia his temporibus versata esset in errore: omnes quippe episcopi vel Cypriani vel Stephani sententiam tuebantur; et utraque secundum Blondelli hypothesin erronea erat.

[c] Vincent. Commonitor. adv. Hæres. c. cx. Agrippinus Carthaginensis episcopus, primus omnium mortalium, contra Divinum canonem, contra universalis ecclesiæ regulam, contra sensum omnium consacerdotum, contra morem ac instituta majorum, rebaptizandum esse censebat. . . . Quum ergo undique ad novitatem rei cuncti reclamarent, atque omnes quaquaversum sacerdotes, pro suo quisque studio, reniterentur, tunc beatæ memoriæ Papa Stephanus, apostolicæ sedis antistes, cum ceteris quidem collegis suis, sed tamen præ ceteris restitit: dignum, ut opinor, existimans, si reliquos omnes tantum fidei devotione vinceret, quantum loci auctoritate superabat. Denique in epistola, quæ tunc ad Africam missa est, idem his verbis sanxit, Nihil novandum, nisi quod traditum est. Intelligebat etenim vir sanctus et prudens, nihil aliud rationem pietatis admittere, nisi ut omnia, qua fide a patribus suscepta forent, eadem fide filiis consignarentur: nosque religionem, non qua vellemus ducere, sed potius qua illa duceret, sequi oportere: idque esse proprium Christianæ modestiæ et gravitatis, non sua posteris tradere, sed a majoribus accepta servare. Quis ergo tunc universi negotii exitus? quis utique nisi usitatus et solitus? Retenta est scilicet antiquitas, et explorata novitas.

Digitized by Google

the dispute was resumed again; and the doctrine of Stephen, with a little variation, was generally received, whilst the doctrine of Cyprian was condemned in the Donatists, who pretended to be followers of his opinion. Now a distinction was first made between heretics and schismatics, and then again between the several sorts of heretics: for some baptized in the name of the Trinity, according to the form of the Church, and others did not: and of those who baptized in the name of the Trinity, some were heterodox, as to the true faith of the Trinity; others were orthodox in that point, but heretical in other opinions: and, according to these distinctions, a difference was made in the reception of their baptisms. The baptism of schismatics was generally received as valid, without any distinction: the baptism of such heretics as did not baptize in the name of the Trinity, and the form of the Church, was as generally rejected: but about the baptism of those who gave baptism in the name of the Trinity, and yet did not believe the true faith of the Trinity, as the Arians and some such others, there was still some question remaining: for Athanasius, and Optatus, and some few others, thought it was not only necessary that men should be baptized in the name of the Trinity, but also into the true faith of the Trinity; and therefore they rejected the baptism of the Arians, because, though they observed the form of baptizing in the name of the Trinity, as it was used in the Church, yet they did not baptize into the true faith of the Trinity, because they denied the divinity of the Son and Holy Ghost; and therefore they thought their baptism was not good, and ought to be repeated: but the generality of the Church were of another mind, and therefore they received the baptism of the Arians also, because they gave baptism in the name of the Trinity, though their faith was not right about it. This was the true state of this matter in the fourth century, when upon occasion of the schism of the Donatists, it came exactly to be considered: and of the truth of all this, the reader may satisfy himself from the testimonies I shall lay before him.

The first decree that was made in this matter, was in the great Council of Arles (an. 314), at which, St. Austin

Digitized by Google

says,[d] near two hundred of the Western bishops were present, though few of their subscriptions are now remaining. In this Council the dispute about heretical baptisms was thus determined, according to the new edition of Sirmond:[e] "We make this decree concerning the Africans, who have been used to rebaptize according to a peculiar law of their own: 'If any one return from his heresy to the Church, let the Catholic priests question him about the Creed; and if they perceive that he was baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, only imposition of hands shall be given him, that he may receive the Holy Ghost. But if upon examination he answers not the Trinity, that is, that he was not baptized in the name of the Trinity, let him be rebaptized.'" All that is here required, is only that a man be baptized in the name of the Trinity, or at most in the faith of the Trinity, to make heretical baptism valid. And no more is required in the great Council of Nice, which has two canons to this purpose:[f] the first of which orders the Novatian schismatics to be admitted upon their return, even to the same degrees among the clergy which they enjoyed before, without any other ceremony than imposition of hands: but the other requires the Paulianists, or Samosatenian heretics, to be rebaptized.[g] Hence it became a general rule, that schismatics were to be admitted universally without rebaptizing, but heretics with some excep-

[d] Aug. adv. Parmen. lib. i. c. v. Usque adeo dementes sunt homines, ut ducentos judices, apud quos victi sunt, victis litigatoribus credant esse postponendos.

[e] Conc. Arelat. I. c. viii. De Afris, quod propria sua lege utuntur ut rebaptizent, placuit, ut si ad ecclesiam aliquis de hac hæresi venerit, interrogent eum [nostræ fidei sacerdotes] symbolum. Et si perviderint eum in Patre, et Filio, et Spiritu Sancto baptizatum; manus ei tantum imponatur, ut accipiat Spiritum Sanctum. Quod si interrogatus non responderit hanc Trinitatem, baptizetur. [The old editions read this canon otherwise: 'De Arianis, qui propria sua lege utuntur, ut rebaptizetur, placuit,' &c. And so it is alleged in Gratian, De Consecrat. Distinct. iv. c. cix.]

[f] Conc. Nic. c. viii. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 240.) Περὶ τῶν ὀνομαζόντων μὲν ἑαυτοὺς καθαροὺς ποτε, προσιρχομένων δὲ τῇ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἔδοξε τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ μεγάλῃ συνόδῳ, ὥστε χειροτονουμένους αὐτοὺς οὕτως μένειν ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ.

[g] Ibid. c. xix. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 245.) Περὶ τῶν Παυλιανισάντων, εἶτα πρεσφυγόντων τῇ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ὅρος ἐκτέθειται, ἀναβαπτίζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐξάπαντος.

Digitized by Google

tion: for they who were in the condition and capacity of the Samosatenians, were to be rebaptized. But the question may be, Upon what account the Paulianists are ordered to be rebaptized more than other heretics? Was it because they did not baptize in the name of the Trinity, or because they rejected the doctrine of the Trinity, though they kept to the form of the Church? Athanasius seems to have been of opinion that it was upon the latter account: for he rejects the baptism of the Arians, though they baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; because, though they used the same form of baptism as was used in the Church, yet they did not believe, as the Church believed, of the divinity of the Son and Holy Ghost. This I take to be the meaning of that famous passage in his third oration against the Arians, where he says,[h] "They did not baptize men into the faith of the Father and Son, but a Creator and a creature, a being made and the Maker of it." By which he did not mean, as some mistake him, that the Arians had changed the form of baptism, which they never did till the time of Eunomius; but that though they baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, yet they did not understand by those names what the Church understood, but believed the Son and Holy Ghost to be mere creatures; and therefore he thought their baptism to be of no effect, because though they baptized in the form of the Church, yet not into the faith of the Holy Trinity. And he concludes the same of the Manichees, and Montanists, and Samosatenians, who, he thinks, used the Catholic form of words, but rejected the true sense and meaning of them. Whence it is plain, Athanasius was one of those who neither universally received, nor universally rejected, heretical baptisms; but such as were given in the Catholic form of words, and in the true faith of the Trinity, those only he admitted; refusing all others as invalid, where either the form or the faith was wanting.

Optatus was of the same opinion, that the baptism of

[h] Athanas. Orat. iii. adv. Arian. Colon. 1686, tom. i. p. 413, (p. 530, edit. Paris. 1698.) Οὐ γὰρ εἰς Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν διδάσκει οἱ Ἀρειανοὶ, ἀλλ' εἰς κτίστην καὶ κτίσμα, καὶ εἰς ποιητὴν καὶ ποίημα.

Digitized by Google

schismatics was to be received as valid, without any distinction, because they were baptized both in the name and the faith of the Trinity:[i] and therefore he tells the Donatists, they never made any scruple about their baptism, nor ever pretended to wash them over again: for as long as the faith was the same, the baptism was the same;[k] and the Donatists were rather to be blamed for rebaptizing those who had been baptized in the faith of the Trinity before. But as to the heretics he made a distinction: for some baptized neither in the name nor the faith of the Trinity: and the baptism of such heretics he calls sacrilegious and profane,[l] and will not allow it to be the same with the one baptism of the Church. The reasons of making such distinctions he assigns in the next words, when he says,[m] "There are three things concur in baptism: 1. The name of the Trinity. 2. The faith of the receiver. 3. The administrator or baptizer. But these three are not all of equal weight and necessity. The Trinity has the principal place in the action, without which baptism cannot be performed: after this comes the faith of the believer: and then the person of the administrator, but that is not of equal authority with the two former." Whence he concludes, that baptism administered in the name and in the faith of the Trinity, whatever the quality of the administrator might be, was not to be repeated.

[i] Optat. cont. Parmen. lib. v. Paris. 1631, p. 85. Quia quidquid in Trinitate factum fuerit, bene est. Inde est, quod simpliciter a vobis venientes accipimus, quum dicit, 'Non habet necessitatem iterum lavandi.' (Du Pin, Antuerp. p. 82.)

[k] Ibid. p. 86. Si datis alterum baptisma, date alteram fidem: si datis alteram fidem, date et alterum Christum: si datis alterum Christum, date alterum Deum. (Du Pin, Antuerp. p. 83, at top.)

[l] Ibid. Per quod unum est, ab hæreticorum profanis et sacrilegis baptismatibus separatur.

[m] Ibid. In hoc sacramento baptismatis celebrando tres esse species constat, quas et vos nec augere, nec minuere, nec prætermittere poteritis. Prima species est in Trinitate; secunda, in credente; tertia, in operante. Sed non pari libramine ponderandæ sunt singulæ. Duas enim video necessarias, et unam quasi necessariam. Principalem locum Trinitas possidet, sine qua res ipsa non potest geri: hanc sequitur fides credentis. Jam persona operantis vicina est, quæ simili auctoritate esse non potest. Duæ priores permanent semper immutabiles et immotæ [junctæ]: Trinitas enim semper ipsa est: fides in singulis una est: vim suam semper retinent ambæ. Persona vero operantis, intelligitur duabus prioribus speciebus par esse non posse, eo quod sola esse videatur mutabilis. &c. (Du Pin, Antuerp. p. 82.)

Digitized by Google

St. Basil delivers his opinion of these baptisms much after the same manner. He thinks that, as to the Novatians, and such other schismatics as did not err in faith, the custom of the Church in every country was to be complied with, whether it was to baptize, or not baptize them again. But as to the Pepuzians or Montanists he thinks much otherwise,[n] and wonders how the great Dionysius could pass them over. For the ancients decreed, that that baptism only should be received, which did not recede from the faith. "Upon which account," he says, "they distinguished betwixt heresies, schisms, and παρασυναγωγαὶ, 'unlawful assemblies.' Heresies denoted such as departed from the faith; schisms, such as contended only about questions of ecclesiastical discipline; and unlawful assemblies were such as were held by presbyters or bishops that were refractory, and would not submit to the laws or rules of the Church; but when they were censured for their crimes, and suspended from officiating, would yet, notwithstanding the canons, pretend to govern or minister as before, and draw people after them out of the Catholic Church. Now," he says, "the ancients thought the baptism of heretics, such as the Manichees, Valentinians, Marcionites, and Pepuzians, was to be wholly disannulled, because they were dissenters about the faith of God: but the baptism of schismatics, as being yet of the Church, was to be received; and such as were baptized in unlawful assemblies, being corrected by true repentance and conversion, were to be admitted again into the Church; as those clergy also, who went off with their refractory leaders, were to be restored to their station again upon their true repentance. Hence he concludes that the Pepuzians were to be rejected as heretics, because they blasphemed the Holy Ghost, attributing his title to Montanus and Priscilla, and did not baptize in the name of the Holy Ghost, but in the name of Father, Son, and Montanus, or Priscilla. And though Dionysius had allowed their baptism, yet we were not to follow him in that mistaken practice. As to the Novatians," he says, "Cyprian and Firmilian

[n] Basil. Epist. c. i. ad Amphiloch. c. i. tom. iii. opp. pp. 20, 21, edit. Paris. 1638.

Digitized by Google

rejected their baptisms, together with that of the Encratitæ, Hydroparastatæ, and Apotactici, being they were broken off from the Church by their separation, and so neither had the Spirit themselves, nor could they give it to others, but were mere laymen, who had no power either to baptize or ordain; and therefore they ordered all such as were baptized by them, to be rebaptized, as persons baptized only by laymen. This was the practice of Cyprian and Firmilian; but, forasmuch as many Churches in Asia received the baptism of such by way of dispensation, his advice is, 'to permit it to be received,' ἔστω δεκτόν: only upon their return they must receive the unction of chrism, or confirmation." Whence it is plain, St. Basil was not so rigid as Cyprian in the baptism of schismatics; but for heretics, who made a breach upon the faith, he rejected their baptism universally, without exception.

But the more general and prevailing interpretation of the Nicene canon was, that the baptism of all heretics and schismatics, who did not reject the Catholic form of baptizing in the name of the Trinity, was to be received, however they might be heterodox in their faith and opinions: for they supposed the Paulianists were therefore to be rebaptized, because they used another form of baptism. This was certainly the sense of the Council of Laodicea, and the second general Council of Constantinople, and the second Council of Arles and Trullo; as also of St. Austin, St. Jerome, Gennadius, Ursinus Afer, Siricius, Leo, Innocentius, the author under the name of Justin Martyr, and the generality of the ancient writers.

The Council of Laodicea has two canons to this purpose: in the former of which, all such as had been baptized by the Novatians, the Photinians, and the Quartadeciman heretics, are ordered to be received to a participation of the holy mysteries,° only first anathematizing their heresies, learning

° Conc. Laodic. c. vii. (Labbé, vol. i. p. 1498.) Περὶ τοῦ, τοὺς ἐκ τῶν αἱρέσεων, τοῦτ' ἔστι, Ναυατιανῶν, ἤτοι Φωτεινιανῶν, ἢ Τεσσαρεσκαιδεκατιτῶν, ἐπιστρεφομένους, ἤτε πιστοὺς τοὺς παρ' ἐκείνοις, μὴ προσδέχεσθαι, πρὶν ἀναθεματίσωσι πᾶσαν αἵρεσιν, ἐξαιρέτως δὲ ἐν ᾗ κατείχοντο· καὶ τότε λοιπὸν τοὺς λεγομένους παρ' αὐτοῖς πιστοὺς, ἐκμανθάνοντας τὰ τῆς πίστεως σύμβολα, χρισθέντας τε τῷ ἁγίῳ χρίσματι, οὕτω κοινωνῶν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τῷ ἁγίῳ.



Digitized by Google

the Catholic Creed, and being anointed with the holy chrism. Here is no mention of a new baptism, but only confirmation upon their return to the Church. But in the next canon,[p] such as return from the heresy of the Cataphrygians or Montanists, though they had been ordained among their clergy, and dignified with the title of Maximi, are appointed both to be catechised and baptized by the bishops and presbyters of the Church. Now, what should be the reason of making such a difference between the baptism of the Photinians and the Montanists (since the Photinians were certainly as erroneous in their opinions about the Trinity as the Montanists could be), but only this, that the Photinians, though they did not believe the divinity of Christ, yet they still kept to the words and form of the Catholic baptism: but the Montanists, some think, changed the form; for they did not baptize in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but in the name of the Father, Son, and Maximilla, or Montanus; as Theophylact,[q] and the learned Suicerus,[r] and others, have observed from him; or else by their errors, they destroyed the very essence of baptism.

The like difference was made by the second general Council of Constantinople (an. 381), between the baptism of the Arians and Macedonians on the one hand, and that of the Eunomians, Montanists, and Sabellians, on the other.[s] The Arians and Macedonians are joined with the Sabbatians, and Novatians, and Quartadecimans, and Apollinarians; all which are to be received only by consignation

[p] Conc. Laodic. c. viii. Τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς αἱρέσεως τῶν λεγομένων Φρυγῶν ἐπιστρέφοντας, εἰ καὶ ἐν κλήρῳ νομιζομένῳ παρ' αὐτοῖς τυγχάνοιεν, εἰ καὶ μέγιστοι λέγοιντο· τοὺς τοιούτους μετὰ πάσης ἐπιμελείας κατηχεῖσθαί τε καὶ βαπτίζεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκόπων τε καὶ πρεσβυτέρων.

[q] Theophylact. Com. in Luc. xxiv. (Venet. 1754, vol. i. p. 497, at bottom.) Ποῦ λοιπὸν αἱ βορβορώδεις γλῶσσαι τῶν βαπτιζόντων εἰς Μοντανὸν, καὶ Πρίσκιλλαν, καὶ Μαξιμίλλαν; ἀληθῶς οὐδεμία οὕτω τοῖς βαπτιζομένοις ἄφεσις, ἀλλὰ καὶ προσθήκη ἁμαρτιῶν ἐπιγίνεται.——Basil. Epist. ad Amphiloch. i. c. i. Τίνα οὖν λόγον ἴσχει τὸ τούτων βάπτισμα ἐγκριθῆναι, τῶν βαπτιζόντων εἰς Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν καὶ Μοντανὸν ἢ Πρίσκιλλαν;

[r] Suicer. Thesaur. Eccles. tom. i. p. 638.

[s] See this matter fully discussed by the learned author of the late curious History of Montanism, Art. xiii. p. 168.

Digitized by Google

or unction of the holy chrism, wherewith they are to be anointed on the forehead, eyes, nose, mouth, and ears, with this form of words: "The seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit." But for the Eunomians, Montanists, and Sabellians, and such other heretics, they are to be received in the same manner as heathens;[t] which was by going through all the stations of the catechumens, in order as they are there mentioned; being the first day made Christians at large, the second day catechumens, the third day exorcised, then catechised and trained up to the discipline of the Church, and at last baptized. Now here it is to be observed, that the Arians and Eunomians are but branches of the same heresy, and yet the one are ordered to be rebaptized, and the other not: the reason of which was evidently this, that the one observed the same form of baptizing as was used in the Church, but the other had introduced a new form of their own inventing. For it is particularly noted of Eunomius, that he made a great many innovations in this matter: he baptized but with one immersion, as is noted in this canon; and Socrates says,[u] that "was not in the name of the Trinity, but in the death of Christ." Epiphanius also observes[w] how they rejected the form of the Trinity, and baptized in the name of the uncreated God, and the name of the created God, and the name of the sanctifying Spirit, created by

[t] Conc. Constant. I. c. vii. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 951, A. 8.) Ἀρειανοὺς μὲν καὶ Μακεδονιανοὺς, καὶ Σαββατιανοὺς, . . . καὶ τοὺς Τεσσαρεσκαιδεκατίτας, εἴτουν Τετραδίτας, καὶ Ἀπολλιναριστὰς δεχόμεθα . . . σφραγιζομένους, ἤ τοι χριομένους πρῶτον τῷ ἁγίῳ μύρῳ τό, τε μέτωπον, καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς, καὶ τὰς ῥῖνας, καὶ τὸ στόμα, καὶ τὰ ὦτα. Καὶ σφραγίζοντες αὐτοὺς λέγομεν· Σφραγὶς δωρεᾶς Πνεύματος ἁγίου. Εὐνομιανοὺς μέντοι, τοὺς εἰς μίαν κατάδυσιν βαπτιζομένους, καὶ Μοντανιστὰς, τοὺς ἐνταῦθα λεγομένους Φρύγας, καὶ Σαβελλιανοὺς . . . ὡς Ἕλληνας δεχόμεθα. Καὶ τὴν πρώτην ἡμέραν ποιοῦμεν αὐτοὺς Χριστιανούς· τὴν δὲ δευτέραν κατηχουμένους· εἶτα τὴν τρίτην ἐξορκίζομεν αὐτοὺς, μετὰ τοῦ ἐμφυσᾶν τρίτον εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ εἰς τὰ ὦτα αὐτῶν. Καὶ οὕτως κατηχοῦμεν αὐτοὺς, καὶ ποιοῦμεν αὐτοὺς χρονίζειν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ ἀκροᾶσθαι τῶν γραφῶν· καὶ τότε αὐτοὺς βαπτίζομεν.

[u] Socrat. lib. v. c. xxiv. (Vales. Amstelod. 1700, p. 240, A. 4.) Πλὴν ὅτι τὸ βάπτισμα παρεχάραξαν· οὐ γὰρ εἰς τὴν Τριάδα, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ βαπτίζουσι θάνατον.

[w] Epiphan. Hæres. lxxvi. Anomœor. (Colon. 1682, vol. i. p. 992, B. 6.) Ἀναβαπτίζει δὲ αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄνομα Θεοῦ ἀπτίστου, καὶ εἰς ὄνομα Υἱοῦ πεπτισμένου, καὶ εἰς ὄνομα Πνεύματος ἁγιαστικοῦ, καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ πεπτισμένου Υἱοῦ πεπισθέντος.

Digitized by Google

the created Son. And Gregory Nyssen, who wrote against Eunomius,[x] brings a like charge against him. So that there was a plain reason for the councils ordering the Eunomians to be rebaptized, whilst they decreed otherwise about the Arians: for the Arians, properly so called, had made no such innovation, which was peculiar to the followers of Eunomius.

The second Council of Arles made two decrees about heretics with the like distinction. In one canon the Photinians, or Paulianists,[y] are ordered to be rebaptized, according to the decrees of the fathers; meaning, no doubt, the decree of the Nicene fathers made in that behalf. But the Bonosiaci, though they maintained the same errors, yet, because they baptized in the name of the Trinity, as the Arians did, are ordered, in the next canon,[z] to be received only with chrism and imposition of hands, as sufficient without a new baptism.

The Council of Trullo treads in the steps of the Councils of Nice and Constantinople, as to the rebaptization of the Paulianists,[a] the Eunomians, the Montanists, and the Sabellians; to which they add the Manichees, Valentinians, and Marcionites, and all suchlike heretics. But the Arians, Macedonians, Quartadecimans, Novatians, Apollinarians, and, as they add, the Nestorians, might be received only by chrism, without a new baptism.

St. Austin delivers his sense of the Nicene canon about the Paulianists after the same manner. He tells us, in his opinion, the reason why the Council appointed them to be rebaptized was, because they did not observe the form or

[x] Nyssen. adv. Eunom. orat. xi. (Paris. 1615, tom. ii. p. 706.) Μὴ εἰς Πατέρα τε καὶ τὸν Υἱὸν καὶ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, καθὼς ἐνετείλατο τοῖς μαθηταῖς, παραδιδοὺς τὸ μυστήριον ἀλλὰ εἰς δημιουργὸν καὶ κτίστην, καὶ οὐ μόνον Πατέρα τοῦ μονογενοῦς, ἀλλὰ τὸν Θεόν.

[y] Conc. Arelat. II. c. xvi. (Labbé, vol. iv. p. 1013.) Photinianos, sive Paulianistas, secundum patrum statuta, baptizari oportet.

[z] Ibid. c. xvii. (Labbé, vol. iv. p. 1013.) Bonosiacos autem ex eodem errore venientes, (quos, sicut Arianos, baptizari in Trinitate manifestum est) si interrogati fidem nostram ex toto corde confessi fuerint, cum chrismate et manus impositione in ecclesia recipi sufficit.

[a] Conc. Trul. c. xcv. al. xcvi. (Labbé, vol. vi. p. 1182.) Ἀρειανοὺς μὲν, &c. See can. vii. Conc. Constant. note (t) in preceding page.

Digitized by Google

rule of baptism,[b] which many other heretics, when they left the Church, carried along with them, and continued still to observe it. So that, as he says in another place,[c] one might easier find heretics that did not baptize at all, than such as did not baptize in that form of evangelical words, of which the Creed consists, without which it was not the baptism of Christ. Forasmuch, then, as they baptized generally in this form, their baptism was admitted as a complete sacrament, though their faith was erroneous. And he makes no scruple to say,[d] that even the baptism of Marcion himself would be true baptism, if it were ministered in that form of evangelical words, "In the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," though his belief under those words was not the true faith of the Catholic Church, but corrupted with false and fabulous doctrines. He also assigns the grounds and reasons of this practice, why the Catholic Church did not repeat their baptism,[e] because the baptism given by heretics was not, properly speaking, their baptism, but the baptism of Christ; which they that once had, could never lose by going out of the Church, and consequently were not to be admitted into the Church again by rebaptization, but repentance. — The Church corrected the errors of their understanding[f] upon their return, but did not violate

[b] Aug. de Hæres. c. xliv. (Bened. 1700, vol. viii. p. 10, D. 9.) Istos sane Paulianos baptizandos esse in ecclesia Catholica Nicæno Concilio constitutum est. Unde credendum est eos regulam baptismatis non tenere, quam secum multi hæretici, quum de Catholica discederent abstulerunt, eamque custodiunt.

[c] Ibid. de Bapt. lib. vi. c. xxv. (Bened. 1700, vol. ix. p. 119, B. 2.) Quis nesciat non esse baptismum Christi, si verba evangelica quibus symbolum constat, illic defuerint? Sed facilius inveniuntur hæretici qui omnino non baptizent, quam qui non illis verbis baptizent.

[d] Ibid. lib. iii. c. xv. (Bened. 1700, vol. ix. p. 78, A. 7.) Quamobrem si Evangelicis verbis, In nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, Marcion baptisma consecrabat, integrum erat sacramentum, quamvis ejus fidem sub eisdem verbis aliud opinantis, quam Catholica veritas docet, non esset integra, sed fabulosis falsitatibus inquinata.

[e] Ibid. lib. iii. c. xi. (Bened. 1700, vol. ix. p. 76, C. 10.) Catholica vero propterea non debet iterare baptismum, qui apud hæreticos datus est, ne judicare videatur ipsorum esse quod Christi est; aut eos non habere, quod intus quum acceperint, amittere utique foras exeundo non possunt.

[f] Ibid. de Unico Baptismo, cont. Petilian. c. iii. (Bened. 1700, vol. ix. p. 360, B.) Si de ipsa Trinitatis unitate dissentientem hæreticum invenio, et tamen

Digitized by Google

the sacrament of God; and he challenges the Donatists[g] to shew him any instance of any man that was ever rebaptized by the Catholics, after he had been once baptized in the name of the Trinity, as the Donatists did. Which shews, that this was the peculiar practice of the Donatists, and not of the Catholic Church.

St. Jerome argues upon the same foot against Hilary the deacon, whom he styles *Deucalion orbis*, 'the rebaptizer of the world,' because he was for rebaptizing all those that had been baptized by the Arian heretics. Hilary, it seems, had gone one step further than his master, Lucifer, and the rest of the Luciferians; for they allowed the baptism of the Arians, though they did not allow their orders, nor grant them in any sense to be Christians, but said they were of the synagogue of Satan. Yet they received such as were baptized by the Arians,[h] not by giving them a new baptism, but only by admitting them to a state of repentance: so they allowed the baptism of those whom they did not allow to be priests, nor so much as Christian laymen. But Hilary here deserted his leaders, and carried the matter one degree further: he said the Arian priests were not only to be deposed, but their laics also to be rebaptized.[i] Against whom St. Jerome urges not only the contrary concessions and practice of his master, Lucifer, but also the testimony of Scripture,[k] proving, from the Revelations, that such as were baptized by heretics, might be received, upon their repentance, without rebaptizing: for

evangelica et ecclesiastica regula baptizatum; intellectum hominis corrigo, non Dei violo sacramentum.

[g] Aug. adv. Fulgent. c. vii. (Bened. 1700, vol. ix. Append. p. 4, D. 10.) Da mihi aliquem sanctorum post Trinitatem rebaptizare, quod facis.

[h] Hieron. Dial. adv. Lucif. c. i. (Venet. Vallars. vol. ii. p. 172.) *Orthodox.* Si Ariani, ut dicis, gentiles sunt, et Arianorum conventicula castra sunt diaboli; quomodo in castris diaboli baptizatum recipis? *Lucif.* Recipio; sed pœnitentem. . . . Aio laicum ab Arianis venientem recipi debere pœnitentem, clericum vero non debere. —— Id. c. v. Eadem ratione a nobis episcopum recipi, qua laicus a vobis recipitur.

[i] Ibid. c. viii. Edisseras quid adversum Hilarium dicendum sit, qui ne baptizatos quidem recipiet ab Arianis.

[k] Ibid. c. viii. De Apocalypsi quoque approbemus, hæreticis sine baptismate debere pœnitentiam concedi. . . . Numquid dixit, 'Rebaptizentur, qui in Nicolaitarum fidem baptizati sunt?'

Digitized by Google

the Nicolaitans were heretics, and yet there were no commands given, that they who were baptized by them, should be baptized again. Then he proves the same from the constant practice of the Roman Church, where Hilary himself was baptized, who could be no Christian if his own doctrine were true; for he was baptized in a Church, which had always received baptism from heretics. Nay, he himself,[l] whilst he was deacon of that Church, had received the baptism of the Manichees and Ebionites; but as soon as Arius arose, he was all on a sudden displeased with himself, and opened a new baptistery against the Church. He that was born in the bosom of the Church, he that was nourished with the milk of her breasts, lift up his sword against her her; calling her harlot, and yet that harlot must be his mother, else he could not prove himself a Christian.— Finally, he concludes both against Hilary and his master, Lucifer, from the authority of the Council of Nice, which received all heretics, except the Samosatenians, and not only admitted the baptism of the Novatians, but allowed their clergy to continue their station in the Church.

In like manner Gennadius tells us,[m] all such as were baptized by heretics in the name or confession of the Trinity, were received as truly baptized, when they came over to the Church. And then if they consented to profess the true faith, they were confirmed by imposition of hands, and so admitted to the participation of the eucharist.

[l] Hieron. Dial. Lucif. c. ix. (Venet. Vallars. vol. ii. p. 199, at bottom.) Si hæretici baptisma non habent, et ideo rebaptizandi ab ecclesia sunt, quia in ecclesia non fuerunt, ipse quoque Hilarius non est Christianus. In ea quippe ecclesia baptizatus est, quæ semper ab hæreticis baptismum recepit. Antequam Ariminensis synodus fieret; antequam Lucifer exularet, Hilarius Romanæ ecclesiæ diaconus ab hæreticis venientes, in eo quod prius acceperant, baptismate suscipiebat. . . . Diaconus eras, o Hilari, et a Manichæis baptizatos recipiebas. Diaconus eras, et Ebionis baptisma comprobabas. Repente, postquam exortus est Arius, totus tibi displicere cœpisti. Segregas te cum tuis vernulis, et novum balneum aperis. (E.) Synodus quoque Nicæna omnes hæreticos suscepit, exceptis Pauli Samosateni discipulis. Et quod his majus est, episcopo Novatianorum, si conversus fuerit, presbyterii gradum servat.

[m] Gennad. de Eccles. Dogmat. c. lii. Si qui apud illos hæreticos baptizati sunt, qui in Sanctæ Trinitatis confessione baptizant, et veniunt ad nos, recipiantur quidem ut baptizati. . . . Et si consentiunt credere, vel acquiescunt confiteri, purgati jam fidei integritate, confirmentur manus impositione, &c.

Digitized by Google

The same author mentions a book of one Ursinus Afer,[n] written on purpose against those who were rebaptizing all heretics, wherein he proved, that such as were either baptized in the name of Christ, or in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, were not to be rebaptized, though they understood the words in a heterodox sense: but when they made confession of the Trinity, the bishop's confirmation by imposition of hands was sufficient for their salvation.

About this time lived the author of the Questions and Responses, which go under the name of Justin Martyr. Among other questions he proposes this for one:[o] "If the baptism administered by heretics be adulterated and vain, why then do not the orthodox rebaptize a heretic when he comes over to the Catholic faith, but allow his adulterated baptism, as well as that which is true?" To which he answers, "That when a heretic comes over to the Catholic faith, the fault of his heterodoxy is corrected by the change of his opinion; and the faultiness of his baptism by the unction of the holy chrism." Here we see, he does not deny but that the baptism of heretics is very faulty; nay, adulterated, spurious, and vain, as to any spiritual effects, whilst they continued heretics; and yet when they come over to the Catholic Church, their baptism is not to be repeated, as simply null and invalid, but to be corrected, amended, and completed in its deficiencies by the ministry of confirmation, which the Greeks call chrism, or the holy unction. And thus we are to understand the word μάταιος, 'vain,' as it is used by Ignatius, and the author of the Constitutions, and other Greek writers, when they speak of the baptism of heretics and schismatics, not as denoting simply the nullity and invalidity of it, but the sinfulness of the action in giving baptism out of the Church, and the inefficacy of it as to

[n] Gennad. de Scriptor. Eccles. c. xxvii. Ursinus monachus scripsit adversus eos, qui rebaptizandos hæreticos decernunt, docens, nec legitimum, &c.

[o] Justin. Quæst. xiv. ad Orthod. (Paris. 1742, p. 446.) Εἰ ἐψυσμένον τυγχάνει καὶ μάταιον τὸ ὑπὸ τῶν αἱρετικῶν διδόμενον βάπτισμα, διὰ τί οἱ ὀρθόδοξοι τὸν προσφεύγοντα τῇ ὀρθοδοξίᾳ αἱρετικὸν οὐ βαπτίζουσιν, ἀλλ', ὡς ἐν ἀληθεῖ, τῷ νόθῳ ἰῶσι βαπτίσματι; Ἀπόκρισις. Τοῦ αἱρετικοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν ὀρθοδοξίαν ἐρχομένου τὸ σφάλμα διορθοῦται, τῆς μὲν κακοδοξίας, τῇ μεταθέσει τοῦ φρονήματος· τοῦ δὲ βαπτίσματος, τῇ ἐπιχρίσει ἁγίου μύρου.

Digitized by Google

salvation, or any other spiritual effects, till men return from their heresies and schisms to the unity of the Church again.

Pope Leo denies the spiritual efficacy of heretical baptism, as much as any man; and yet he was utterly against rebaptizing: for he gives this direction to Nicetius, bishop of Aquileia,[p] "That such as received baptism from heretics, having not been baptized before, were to be received only by invocation of the Holy Spirit, and imposition of hands; and that because they had before only received the form of baptism, without the sanctifying power of it." He gives a like resolution to the question of Rusticus Narbonensis:[q] "Those that know they have been baptized in the form of the Church, but know not what faith they were of that baptized them, are not to be rebaptized; but by imposition of hands, and invocation of the Holy Spirit, whose grace they could not have from heretics, are to be united to the communion of Catholics." And this he learned from the practice of his predecessors, Innocentius and Siricius: whereof the one says,[r] "It was their custom to receive into the communion of Catholics, as well Arians as Novatians, and other heretics, only by invocation of the seven graces of the Spirit, with imposition of the bishop's hands, as it had been decreed in council:"—meaning the decree which the Council of Nice, or the Council of Arles, had made to this purpose. "And this," he says, "was then observed both in

[p] Leo, Epist. lxxvii. al. lxxix. ad Nicet. c. vii. (Labbé, vol. iii. p. 1372.) Hi qui baptismum ab hæreticis acceperunt, quum baptizati antea non fuissent, sola invocatione Spiritus Sancti per impositionem manuum confirmandi sunt, quia formam tantum baptismi sine sanctificationis virtute sumserunt.

[q] Ibid. Epist. xcii. ad Rustic. c. xviii. p. 1408. Non se isti se baptizatos nesciunt, sed cujus fidei fuerint, qui eos baptizaverunt, se nescire profitentur. Unde quolibet modo formam baptismatis acceperint, baptizandi non sunt: sed per manus impositionem, invocata virtute Spiritus Sancti, quam ab hæreticis accipere non potuerunt, Catholicis copulandi sunt.——Id. Epist. xxxvii. ad Leon. Raven. c. ii. (Labbé, vol. iii. p. 1316.) Quod si ab hæreticis baptizatum quempiam fuisse constiterit, erga hunc nullatenus sacramentum regenerationis iteretur: sed hoc tantum, quod ibi defuit, conferatur, ut per episcopalem manus impositionem virtutem Sancti Spiritus consequatur.

[r] Siric. Epist. i. ad Himerium Tarracon. c. i. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 1018, A. 12.) Arianos cum Novatianis aliisque hæreticis, sicut est in synodo constitutum, per invocationem solam septiformis Spiritus, episcopalis manus impositione, Catholicorum conventui sociamus. . . . Quod etiam totus Oriens Occidensque custodit.

Digitized by Google

the Eastern and Western Churches." His other predecessor, Innocentius, affirms the same,[s] "That the baptism of the Arians was allowed as valid; and when they were converted, they were received by penance and imposition of hands, which was the means of procuring for them the sanctification of the Holy Spirit." And so for the Novatians and Donatists, he determines,[t] "That those who came over from them, should be received only by imposition of hands; because, though they were baptized by heretics, yet they were baptized in the name of Christ."

In another place he explains the reason, why the Council of Nice allowed the baptism of the Novatians, but not the Paulianists:[u] "Because the Paulianists did not baptize in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, which the Novatians did, who, in the point of the Divine power of the Trinity, always maintained the orthodox faith." Such, therefore, as came over from heresies of the like kind with the Novatians, it was the custom[w] of the Church of Rome to receive with imposition of hands to lay-communion, but not to allow them orders, he says; which was a matter of discipline, in which the Church used a liberty to extend or relax her censures, as she thought proper in her own wisdom and discretion.—It were easy to add many other testimonies of the like nature; but I suppose these are abundantly sufficient both to evince and explain the general sense of the Church upon this head, that they allowed as valid the

[s] Innocent. Epist. xviii. ad Alexand. Antioch. c. iii. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 1269.) Eorum laicos conversos ad Dominum, sub imagine pœnitentiæ ac Sancti Spiritus sanctificatione per manus impositionem suscipimus . . . quoniam quibus solum baptisma ratum esse permittimus, quod utique in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti perficitur.

[t] Innocent. Epist. ii. ad Victricium, c. viii. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 1251.) Ut venientes a Novatianis vel Montensibus, per manus tantum impositionem suscipiantur: quia quamvis ab hæreticis, tamen in Christi nomine sunt baptizati.

[u] Ibid. Epist. xxii. ad Episc. Macedon. c. v. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 1275, B.) Idcirco distinctum esse ipsis duabus hæresibus, ratio manifesta declarat: quia Paulianistæ in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti minime baptizabant: et Novatiani iisdem tremendis venerandisque nominibus baptizant.

[w] Ibid. c. iv. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 1274.) Nostræ lex est ecclesiæ, venientibus ab hæreticis, qui tamen illic baptizati sint, per manus impositionem laicam tantum tribuere communionem, nec ex his aliquem in clericatus honorem vel exiguum subrogare.

Digitized by Google

baptism of all heretics that baptized in the name of the Trinity; though some few required they should be baptized in the true faith, as well as the true form, to make their baptism effectual.

SECT. XXI.—*What Defects there are in the Baptism of Heretics and Schismatics, and how those Defects are supplied.*

But now though the baptism of heretics, and schismatics, and degraded or excommunicated clerks, was reputed valid, so as it need not to be repeated; yet it was not esteemed so perfect to all intents and purposes as the regular and authorized baptism of the Church; because both on the part of the receiver, and on the part of the giver, there were some deficiencies in it. We must therefore inquire, in the next place, what the ancients supposed such baptism could give? Then, what were its deficiencies, and what it could not give? And, how those deficiencies were supplied? For the resolution of these questions, St. Austin, who has considered this matter most exactly, often inculcates a known distinction between the external or visible sacrament, and the invisible or spiritual grace; the former of which[x] is common both to good and bad men in the Church; but the latter is peculiar only to those that are good. Now he supposes such as are baptized by heretics and schismatics, to be much in the same state as bad men in the Church: they receive the outward visible sacrament, but not the invisible, internal, and sanctifying grace of the Spirit. So that it cannot be said that they receive nothing at all; for they receive as much, almost, as wicked men in the Church; of whom it may be truly said, that they have received the sacrament of baptism, and need not, upon any occasion, to be rebaptized again: and further, that they are hereby made partakers of all such privileges, as the receiving the outward and visible sacrament of baptism can give to such as debar themselves (by some obstacle of their own) from the invisible and spiritual grace of it. Their

[x] Aug. cont. Litter. Petilian. lib. ii. c. civ. (Bened. 1700, vol. ix. p. 199, D.) Discerne visibile sanctum sacramentum, quod esse et in bonis et in malis potest, illis ad præmium, illis ad judicium, ab invisibili unctione caritatis, quæ propria bonorum est.

Digitized by Google

baptism makes them something more than mere heathens, who need baptism before they can come into the Church: it gives them a title to be members of the visible Church at large, though they are not true members of the invisible and spiritual Church, because they are not yet sanctified by the Spirit of Christ: it qualifies them for pardon upon their repentance, whenever they return from their vicious practices, and takes away those bars and obstacles, that hindered the descent of the Spirit at their first admission; nay, though they turn heretics, or schismatics, or become lapsers, or excommunicate, or even apostates, they need not a new baptism, but only repentance and absolution, to return to the Church again; the seal and character of their baptism remaining in this respect for ever indelible upon them, so as to qualify them to be admitted, ever after, to pardon and forgiveness, upon a true repentance.—These are privileges that a wicked man has, by virtue of his having received the outward form of baptism, or the visible sacrament in the Church, though all the time, by his own fault, he be destitute of pardon of sins, and all the invisible graces and operations of the Holy Spirit. As the baptism of Simon Magus was a true baptism, though he was an unworthy, and therefore an unprofitable, receiver of it: and, as the sacrament of the eucharist is a true sacrament, though many men eat it not to their soul's health, but to their own damnation, because they are unworthy receivers of it.

Now as the case was with wicked men, who thus received baptism in the Church, that they gained hereby some privileges, but not all, nor the chief of those that belonged to it; so the ancients supposed the case of those to be, who were baptized in an uncharitable opposition and contempt of authority, by heretics, or schismatics, or excommunicate and degraded clergymen: their baptism, if done in due form, intituled them to some privileges, but not all, that might be expected from it in the Church. It was the visible sacrament of baptism, and therefore made them something more than heathens, and qualified them for some, if not all, of the forementioned privileges; so that, upon their repentance and return to the Church, they needed not to be received as mere

Digitized by Google

heathens, by having their baptism repeated again: but then it wanted the internal and invisible grace, particularly the grace of unity and charity, which completes all other graces, and which heretics and schismatics were not supposed qualified to give, nor they who desired baptism at their hands, qualified to receive, till they returned with repentance and charity to the unity of the Church again: and then the Church, by imposition of hands, and invocation of the Holy Spirit, might obtain for them those blessings and graces which might have been had in baptism, if they themselves had not been the obstacle, and put in a bar against them. This I take to be the true state of this matter, as generally delivered by such of the ancients as defended the validity of heretical baptism. For as to those who pleaded against it, and stood up for rebaptization, they argued upon a quite contrary and mistaken notion, that the visible sacrament and the invisible grace must necessarily be united together to make a true sacrament; and that neither could the Spirit operate without the water, nor the water without the Spirit. Which was the chief argument used by Nemesianus a Tubunis, in the famous Council of Carthage, for rebaptization under Cyprian: to which St. Austin returns a very satisfactory answer, upon Cyprian's own principles, only by distinguishing a double notion of the Spirit:[y] "For if the presence of the Spirit be necessary to every true baptism, it

[y] Aug. de Bapt. lib. vi. c. xii. (Bened. 1700, vol. ix. p. 113, E. 7.) Aliud est, Omnis qui intrabit in regnum cœlorum, prius nascitur ex aqua et Spiritu, quia nisi renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu, non intrabit in regnum cœlorum: quod Dominus dixit, et verum est: aliud autem, Omnis, qui nascitur ex aqua et Spiritu, intrabit in regnum cœlorum; quod utique falsum est. Nam et Simon ille Magus natus erat ex aqua et Spiritu, et tamen non intravit in regnum cœlorum. Sic fieri potest, ut hæreticis etiam contingat. Aut si non nascitur ex Spiritu, nisi qui veraci conversione mutatur, omnes qui sæculo verbis et non factis renuntiant, non utique de Spiritu, sed ex aqua sola nascuntur: qui tamen et intus, teste Cypriano, sunt. (P. 114.) Necesse est enim, ut unum de duobus concedatur: aut illi qui fallaciter sæculo renuntiant, nascuntur de Spiritu, quamvis ad perniciem, non ad salutem, atque ita possunt et hæretici; aut si illud quod scriptum est, 'Sanctus Spiritus disciplinæ effugiet fictum,' etiam ad hoc valet, ut fallaciter sæculo renuntiantes non nascantur de Spiritu; potest quis baptizari aqua, et non nasci de Spiritu; frustra Nemesianus ait, 'Neque Spiritus sine aqua operari potest, nec aqua sine Spiritu.'

Digitized by Google

must be only in such a sense as Simon Magus, or any other wicked wretch, who is baptized in the Church, may be said to be born again of water and of the Spirit, who yet shall never enter into the kingdom of heaven; and the case of heretics may be such, *i. e.* to be born of water and the Spirit without salvation. But if by the Spirit be meant only the Spirit of true conversion, then all those who renounce the world in words and not in deeds, are not born of the Spirit, but of water alone, who yet, in Cyprian's opinion, are truly baptized in the Church. For one of these two things must needs be granted: either those who fallaciously renounce the world, are born of the Spirit, though to their destruction, not salvation; and then heretics may be so too: or else, if that saying of the Book of Wisdom, 'The Holy Spirit of discipline will not dwell with a hypocrite,' be taken to signify, that they who fallaciously renounce the world, are not born of the Spirit; then a man may be born of water alone and not of the Spirit. And Nemesianus disputed to no purpose, when he said, 'That the Spirit cannot operate without the water, nor the water without the Spirit.'" It is plain, from this discourse of St. Austin, that the great deficiency of heretical baptism was, that either it did not minister the Spirit at all, or else, at least, not to such a degree, as was effectual to sanctification and salvation. And this deficiency was therefore necessary to be supplied, upon their return to the Catholic Church. There was but one case, he thinks, in which heretical baptism could avail any man to salvation, and that was when it was such a case of necessity[z] as that a man could not have baptism from any other, and then the man, in heart, was still united to the

[z] Aug. de Bapt. lib. vii. c. lii. (Bened. 1700, vol. ix. p. 136, B. 3.) Illi qui sic sunt in magna domo tanquam vasa in contumeliam . . . neque omnino utiliter habent baptismum, neque ab eis utiliter accipitur, nisi forte accipiendi necessitas urgeat, et accipientis animus ab unitatis vinculo non recedat: tamen et habent, quamquam inutiliter habeant; et accipitur ab eis, etiam quum inutile est accipientibus; quod ut fiat utile, ab hæresi vel schismate recedendum est, et illi domui cohærendum: quod non solum hæretici et schismatici, sed etiam illi facere debent, qui sic sunt in domo per communionem sacramentorum, ut extra domum sint per diversitatem morum; sic enim et ipsis utile incipit esse sacramentum, quod aliter inutile est.

Digitized by Google

Catholic Church: but in all other cases their baptism was unprofitably received; and to make it otherwise it was necessary for men to forsake their heresy or schism, and join themselves to the Catholic Church. Even as they who were in the Church by the communion of the sacraments, but out of it by the diversity of their morals, were obliged to reform their lives, in order to make their baptism profitable, which before was of little advantage to them: therefore, St. Austin says,[a] he had no dispute with Cyprian upon this point; he agreed entirely with him thus far, that heretics could not grant remission of sins: this was the deficiency of their baptism, which both in the giver and receiver was only to destruction, because they misused so great a gift of God. But, then, the same deficiency was many times in the baptism of those who were baptized in the Church, because they were baptized in enmity and hatred of their brethren, and in that state could not have forgiveness of sins: yet this deficiency was not supplied by a new baptism, but by repentance and true conversion, whereby that pardon was obtained, which they had not merited, nor were qualified to receive before.

Nor was this the singular opinion of St. Austin, about the deficiency of heretical baptism, but the general sense of the Church: for which reason they appointed, that imposition of hands should be given to such as returned to the Church, in order to obtain the grace of the Holy Ghost for them by prayer, which they wanted before, as having received baptism from those who had no power to give the Holy Ghost. For thus Innocent, bishop of Rome, who was contemporary with St. Austin, says of the baptism of the Arians,[b] "That their

[a] Aug. de Bapt. lib. v. c. xxii. (Bened. 1700, vol. ix. p. 105, B. 8.) Proinde consentimus Cypriano, 'hæreticos remissionem dare non posse;' baptismum autem dare posse, quod quidem illis et dantibus et accipientibus valeat ad perniciem, tamquam tanto munere Dei male utentibus. . . . Quanto magis fieri non potest, ut eis peccata dimittantur, qui fratres a quibus diliguntur oderunt, et in ipso odio baptizantur; quibus tamen postea correctis non rursus baptismus datur, sed ipsa venia quam tunc accipere non meruerunt, in vera conversione præstatur.

[b] Innocent. Epist. xviii. ad Alexand. Antioch. c. iii. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 1269.) Nec Spiritum Sanctum eos habere ex illo baptismate illisque mysteriis arbitramur: quoniam cum a Catholica fide eorum auctores desciscerent, perfectionem Spiritus quam acceperant, amiserunt. . . . Quorum laicos imperfectos, ut dixi, ad Sancti Spiritus percipiendam gratiam, cum pœnitentiæ imagine recipiamus?

Digitized by Google

ministration was defective in this, that they could not give the Holy Ghost; and therefore such as were baptized by them, were imperfect, and were to be received with imposition of hands, that they might thereby obtain the grace of the Holy Ghost." Pope Leo says,[c] "They had only the form of baptism, without the grace of sanctification; and, therefore, when they came over to the Catholic Church, though the form of baptism was not to be repeated, yet what was wanting in it, was to be supplied, that by imposition of the bishop's hands they might receive the grace of the Holy Ghost." And that this was the true and only method of supplying the defects of heretical baptism, is evident from all the passages that have been alleged in the last section, which speak of the use of the sacred unction, which was joined with imposition of hands and prayer, to implore the grace of remission of sins, and the other gifts of the Holy Spirit, which were wanting before. To all which I shall only add these two observations further, to shew the necessity of supplying the defects of heretical and schismatical baptism by confirmation, or imposition of hands and prayer, upon men's reconciliation and returning to the Catholic Church. The first is, that imposition of hands, or confirmation, was thought so necessary in this case, that though it was ordinarily only the office of the bishop to perform it, yet in cases of extreme necessity, when one who had been baptized by heretics, was in danger of death, and could not come to the bishop; a presbyter, in that exigency, was authorized to give him that solemn imposition of hands used in the prayer of confirmation, and invocation of the Holy Spirit, rather than he should die without it. This is evident from the first Council of Orange, which made this decree,[d] "That if any heretics at the point of death desire to be received as Catholics, in the absence of the bishop, the presbyters shall give them the consignation of chrism and the benediction."

[c] See notes (p) and (q), p. 73, of this volume.

[d] Conc. Arausic. c. i. (Labbé, vol. iii. p. 1447.) Hæreticos in mortis discrimine positos, si Catholici esse desiderant, si desit episcopus, a presbyteris cum chrismate et benedictione consignari placuit.

Digitized by Google

And so in the Council of Epone a like order was made,[e] "That if any heretics, who lay desperately sick upon their beds, desired suddenly to be converted; in that case, for the salvation of their souls, which was heartily desired, a presbyter is permitted to give them the consolation of chrism: which those that were in health, were to go to the bishop for at their conversion." Here we may take notice, that this confirmation, or solemn invocation of the Holy Spirit, was thought more necessary for such as were baptized by heretics and schismatics, upon their return to the Church, than for those that were baptized in the Church: for many of those who were baptized in the Church, in country towns and villages, died, as St. Jerome observes,[f] before the bishop could come to give them confirmation; and yet no such rule was made in that case, for presbyters to confirm them: the reason of which was, that they had received the grace of the Holy Spirit in their baptism (which heretics had not); and therefore there was no such absolute necessity of confirming them, in order to die in peace and safety: but heretics could not die securely without it; and therefore the Church, in compassion to dying heretics, authorized even presbyters, in cases of extreme necessity, to give them confirmation, which, in other cases, was the ordinary office of the episcopal function. 2. The other observation I would make in relation to this matter is, that imposition of hands was thought so necessary for heretics upon their return, that even those who had received it before in their heretical baptism, received it again when they were reconciled to the Church. The reason of which was, because heretics and schismatics, during their separation, were supposed neither qualified to

[e] Conc. Epaonens. c. xvi. (Labbé, vol. iv. p. 1578.) Presbyteros, propter salutem animarum, quam in cunctis optamus, desperatis et in lecto decumbentibus hæreticis; si conversionem subitam petant, chrismate subvenire permittimus. Quod omnes conversuri, si sani sunt, ab episcopo noverint expetendum.

[f] Hieron. Dial. adv. Lucifer. c. iv. (Venet. Vallars. vol. ii. p. 181, D. 4.) Idem factitatum reperimus, ad honorem potius sacerdotii quam ad legem necessitatis. Alioqui si ad episcopi tantum imprecationem Spiritus Sanctus defluit; lugendi sunt, qui in villulis, aut in castellis, aut in remotioribus locis, per presbyteros et diaconos baptizati, ante dormierunt quam ab episcopis inviserentur. He says a little before: Spiritum Sanctum nos adserimus in vero baptismate tribui.



Digitized by Google

give nor receive the Holy Ghost, either by baptism, or imposition of hands, or the consignation of chrism, for some heretics ministered all these; and yet imposition of hands was given them again when they returned to the Church. This is plain in the case of the Donatists. They not only retained baptism, but also the unction of chrism and imposition of hands, as the Church did. For so both St. Austin[g] and Optatus testify of them; and yet they could not give the Holy Spirit by any of them. Therefore when they came over to the Church, though neither the outward form of baptism nor chrism was repeated upon them, yet imposition of hands was repeated, because that was no more than a prayer to implore the gift of the Holy Ghost to descend upon them, which might be repeated as often as there was occasion for it. Optatus says expressly,[h] "That neither the baptism nor the unction of the Donatists was repeated: but imposition of hands was repeated, because this was necessary as a prayer to implore the Divine blessing, and convey the invisible unction of the Holy Spirit to them, which they were not in a capacity to receive before." Therefore St. Austin says,[i] "Imposition of hands was not like baptism, a thing that might not be repeated: for it was no more than praying over a man for a blessing:" which may be done whenever there is occasion for it: and therefore it was thought necessary to be done when heretics came over to the Church, to supply the defects of their baptism, which did not minister

[g] Aug. cont. Litteras Petilian. lib. ii. c. civ. (Bened. 1700, vol. ix. p. 199, B. 8.) In hoc unguento sacramentum chrismatis vultis interpretari: quod quidem in genere visibilium signaculorum sacrosanctum est, sicut ipse baptismus: sed potest esse et in hominibus pessimis, in operibus carnis vitam consumentibus, et regnum cœlorum non possessuris.

[h] Optat. cont. Parmen. lib. vii. p. 109. Quod a nobis unctum est, tale servamus, quale accepimus, &c. [De non repetita manuum impositione nihil in his verbis, nec in antecedentibus vel consequentibus, habetur: erronea videtur allegatio.—Grischow.]

[i] Aug. de Bapt. lib. iii. c. xvi. (Bened. 1700, vol. ix. p. 78, last line.) Manus autem impositio non sicut baptismus repeti non potest. Quid enim aliud est, nisi oratio super hominem? —— Alcim. Avit. Epist. xxiv. ad Stephan. Manus impositionem personæ, de qua scribitis, adhibete; quam constat, si revera in supradicti schismatis professione versata est, cum ministerio baptismatis etiam chrismate consignatam.

Digitized by Google

with the outward visible form the invisible grace of the Holy Spirit before. I have said thus much upon this head, to shew those who are baptized in heresy or schism, what was the true ancient method of reconciliation, and the way to die securely in the peace and communion of the Church. And if all persons concerned would observe this method, there would be no need of disputes about rebaptization in the Church: for it appears, that the unauthorized baptism of heretics and schismatics may be reputed valid, and, without rebaptizing, have its defects supplied by imposition of hands in confirmation.

SECT. XXII. — *Whether the Baptism of Heretics and Schismatics be any more than the Baptism of unauthorized Laymen?*

There remains one question more to be resolved concerning heretics, and schismatics, and degraded clergymen; Whether in that capacity, as they were unauthorized in all their ministrations, they were reputed to be of the body of the clergy, or of the laity, or in a middle rank betwixt both? And, Whether the baptisms, administered by them in such a state, were of any greater account than the baptisms of unauthorized laymen? This question is much of the same nature with that other, Whether a heretic be a Christian? Which is not to be resolved without a nice distinction: for if by a Christian be meant one that is not a mere heathen, but one that has received baptism so firm and valid, as that if the man turns heretic, or schismatic, or apostate, or becomes excommunicate, his baptism, notwithstanding, will remain so indelible and inviolable, as that he shall never need a second baptism to be admitted into the Church again; —in this sense the ancients would make no scruple to affirm, that heretics were Christians. But if by a Christian be meant one that is of the Catholic and orthodox faith, and in the bosom and unity of the holy Catholic Church; then they would make as little scruple to deny heretics to be Christians, but compare them to Jews and Pagans, as being enemies to true religion, and destitute of the means of salvation as well

Digitized by Google

as the other: as I have had occasion to shew in another discourse.[k]

Now the question, Whether heretics be clergymen or laymen, priests or not priests, bishops or not bishops? is to be resolved much after the same manner. If by a bishop or priest be meant one that has received such an ordination from the Church to the office of bishop or priest, as that if the man turns heretic, or schismatic, or apostate, or is excommunicate, or degraded, yet his ordination remains so far indelible and inviolable, as that if the Church thinks fit, after all his crimes and suspensions, to admit him, upon his repentance, to officiate in that station again, he shall not need a new ordination to qualify him for it;—in this sense there are none among the ancients but will allow heretics and schismatics to be bishops or priests, according to their respective orders. Some, indeed, were against their being allowed to officiate in those dignities, and were for depriving them wholly of those honours, when they returned to the Catholic Church; as thinking them unworthy to enjoy those privileges, who had so manifestly prevaricated with the Church, and gone contrary to the design and duties of their station: but none ever said, that if the Church should think fit to allow them to continue in her service, she must, of necessity, give them a new ordination. Thus far, therefore, they were allowed to be of the clergy: and upon this foot many churches and councils accepted them upon their return, as I have shewed elsewhere,[l] and permitted them to continue in their offices without a re-ordination. And when, in the discipline of the Church, it was thought proper to deprive them of the power and honour of their places, yet, even in that case, the Church did not intend to deny the validity of their ordination, but supposed that to remain still so entire, as that if ever after the Church should recall them to those offices, she would not do it by giving them a new ordination, any more than a new baptism. Which is largely

[k] Origin. Eccles. book i. chap. iii. sect. iv.

[l] Origin. Eccles. book iv. chap. vii. sect. vii. viii.

Digitized by Google

insisted on by St. Austin[m] against the Donatists, and St. Jerome[n] against the Luciferians; both which sects pleaded for the invalidity of heretical ordinations, but were refuted upon this principle of the Catholic Church, that baptism and ordination, though sinfully given, if they be valid, are not to be wholly annulled, or afterward repeated. In this sense heretics, and schismatics, and degraded priests, were allowed to be priests still, and their acts to be valid, though done irregularly, sinfully, and unlawfully, against the rule and authority of the Church, to their own destruction.

But then, on the other hand, if by priests be meant only presbyters, acting by the just and lawful authority of their bishop, in due subordination to him, and in the unity of the Church, and according to the Catholic laws and rules thereof; so as when either they desert the communion of the Church, or are justly degraded for their crimes, they can no longer be said to act by her lawful authority, but in manifest contempt and opposition to her rules. And if by laymen are meant, all those who, by the discipline and just censures of the Church, are degraded from their clerical offices, and reduced to the state of lay-communion;—in this sense the ancients would not allow heretics and schismatics to be of the clergy, but censured them as men out of office; or, as anti-episcopal usurpers, who set up another altar against their bishop; and esteemed their acts as much unauthorized, sinful, and irregular, as those of any unauthorized laymen; nay, and esteemed them in some sense laymen too, when once they were formally degraded, and reduced to the communion of laymen: which was making them laymen as much as was in the Church's power to do it, by divesting them of their offices, and withdrawing all legal authority to execute such offices from them, and so leaving them in an

[m] Aug. cont. Parmen. lib. ii. c. xiii. (Bened. 1700, vol. ix. p. 29, D. 5.) Si visum est opus esse, ut eadem officia gererent quæ gerebant, non sunt rursum ordinati; sed sicut baptismus in eis, ita ordinatio mansit integra. . . . Et quum expedire hoc judicatur ecclesiæ, ut præpositi eorum, venientes ad Catholicam societatem, honores suos ibi non administrent; non eis tamen ipsa ordinationis sacramenta detrahuntur, sed manent super eos.

[n] Hieron. Dial. adv. Luciferian. [Nihil in hoc dialogo, quod huc spectet, invenias.— Grischow.]

Digitized by Google

unauthorized state of anti-episcopal usurpation. The Church, indeed, did not pretend wholly to cancel or annul their ordination, or give them a new ordination, when she authorized them to officiate again: but she could and did, by her discipline and censures, deprive them of the execution of her sacred offices, and reduce them in all other respects to the quality of laymen; and then, if they acted in that state, it was not by her authority, but as usurpers and invaders. So that the answer to the question proposed, we see, depends entirely upon these distinctions: as they had an ordination that could not be wholly disannulled, they were in some measure entitled to the name and character of clerks: but as they were divested of all lawful authority to execute any sacred office, they were in the state and capacity of laymen; and so, upon different accounts, as it were, in a sort of middle state betwixt both.

Upon the whole matter, the result of our inquiry concerning heretics, and schismatics, and degraded clergymen, is this:—1. They all act in opposition to the Church's lawful authority, and therefore have not her lawful authority to baptize. 2. Notwithstanding this, their baptisms, if done in due form, are valid, and not to be repeated. Yet, 3. Those baptisms have great deficiencies, particularly that they do not minister remission of sins, and other invisible graces of the Holy Spirit, except where it pleases God to supply them in extraordinary mercy, and in an extraordinary way, to infants, or others, who are baptized by heretics in cases of necessity, for want of other lawful ministers: which deficiencies are to be supplied by imposition of hands, and invocation of the Holy Spirit, upon their repentance and return to the Catholic Church. And this, whether heretics, acting in that capacity, be considered, fourthly, either as clergymen or laymen, or in a middle state betwixt both: for, whatever capacity they act in, their baptisms are not properly the legal and authorized baptisms of the Church, and therefore have need of some subsequent authority to confirm them. This is the sum of the doctrine of the ancients, concerning the baptism of heretics, and their reception into the Church.

Digitized by Google

SECT. XXIII. — *How the Church of England comes to have Authority to Baptize, though she had her Baptism only from the Heretical Church of Rome?*

If it be inquired now, How the reformed Church of England comes to have full and ample authority to baptize, which before was a heretical and schismatical Church, under the slavery of the Romish yoke; — I answer, by shaking off that yoke, and reforming her errors, and returning to the unity of the Catholic Church: which was the ancient method for schismatical and heretical bishops, and other clergy, to gain that lawful authority that empowered them to officiate legally, which they had not, nor could not have, whilst they continued in their errors, and out of the unity of the holy Catholic Church. Thus the great Council of Nice decreed, in the case of the Novatians,[o] "That upon their return to the Church they should continue in the same station and clerical degrees they were in before, only receiving a reconciliatory imposition of hands, by way of absolution." And by virtue of this they had now the full power and license of the Church to authorize them to officiate, which they certainly had not before. And this was the case of the Donatists in the time of St. Austin, as appears from the writings of that father, and several canons in the African Code; of which I have given a particular account in another place.[p] The same rule and method, then, which was used and allowed in the Primitive Church, was that which authorized the English bishops and priests to officiate legally, upon their reforming from their heretical and schismatical errors and corruptions, and returning to the strict and perfect unity of the holy Catholic Church. And so those persons, who could only give valid baptism before, as heretics and schismatics may do by a kind of usurpation, were now qualified, authoritatively, to give it every way legal, perfect, and authentic.

But some will be ready to ask, Where was that holy Catholic Church, to which our first Reformers are supposed

[o] Conc. Nic. c. viii. See above, sect. xx. note (f), p. 61.
[p] Origin. Eccles. book iv. chap. vii. sect. vii. viii.

Digitized by Google

to return? Which is much such another question as that other, Where was your Church before Luther? To which I answer, It was where the holy Catholic faith and doctrine of the Creed and Scriptures was maintained, without the addition of the Romish errors and corruptions: and though there had been no visible professors of that faith and doctrine entirely pure, yet it had been sufficient for the first Reformers to have returned to the profession of the faith itself; which, in effect, is returning to the unity of the holy Catholic Church, the chief and principal part of whose unity is the sincere faith of the Creed and Scriptures. But we can shew also where there were visible professors of this faith, in every age perhaps, who always opposed the corruptions of the Romish Church, and kept themselves free from her heretical stains and pollutions. And why might not our first Reformers, by joining themselves to the faith and communion of those visible professors, be said to return to the unity of the holy Catholic Church in the strictest and most perfect notion of the unity thereof? Some of those noble professors were the Waldenses, or the Albigenses, and the Fratres Bohemi, whose history is so famous in latter ages. And many worthy writers have deserved excellently of the Church of God, who have endeavoured to preserve their memory, and writings, and confessions of faith, as standing monuments and lasting evidences of their religion; and also to clear their character of the black and odious imputations, which their adversaries have falsely and industriously thrown upon them. Such are the learned labours of Archbishop Usher, and Sir Samuel Morland, and Dr. Allix among ourselves, and those of the learned Albertinus and Joachim Hesterberg; but especially the great treasuries and collections of Mr. Paul Perrin and Balthasar Lydius, with the golden history of the persecutions of the Church of Bohemia, in most of which we may find their doctrines and principles to be the same with those of the Reformation. Here were vast numbers of Catholic and visible professors, as the reader may easily judge by this one observation, which Dr. Crakanthorp long ago made out of Bzovius's Annals,[q]

[q] Crakanthorp. Defens. Eccles. Anglic. cont. Spalat. c. xviii. p. 101. Quod

Digitized by Google

"That there were no less than a hundred and forty-two thousand nine hundred and ninety of the Albigenses miserably slaughtered in one age, in the one kingdom of France, within the space of threescore years. And then," as he says, "who can enumerate, or even but conceive in his mind, what myriads of myriads, in all other parts of Europe, for the space of four hundred years and more, from the time of Pope Hildebrand, were devoured with fire and sword, by the beast which is drunk with the blood of the saints? Or who can speak of these things without weeping? If there were so many martyrs, the whole product of the Church was certainly much greater: for the blood of the martyrs always makes an increase." So then, without further inquiry, there were numbers enough of Catholic professors for the Church of England to join with at the Reformation, from her former errors and heresies of Rome. And that nothing might seem to be wanting, these were episcopal churches too, and great care was always taken to preserve episcopacy among them. Spondanus himself tells us,[r] the Albigenses were once so powerful in France, as to think of setting up one of their bishops as a general patriarch of their order, against the pope; and that Bartholomæus of Carcasson was his substitute in the French dominions. And that they had bishops among them, is otherwise evident from the History of the Persecutions of the Bohemian Church, supposed to be written by Comenius, a bishop of

non minus centum et quadraginta duo millia, nongenti et nonaginta de Albigensibus, uno eodemque sæculo, intra sexaginta annorum decursum, in regno Galliæ misere trucidati fuerint. . . . Quis enumerare, aut etiam animo ac mente concipere potest, quot centena millia, in reliquis Europæ partibus, intra quadringentos annos et amplius, inde a temporibus Hildebrandi Papæ, igne ac ferro a bestia, sanctorum sanguine ebria, peremta sint? Aut quis de hisce rebus loqui sine lacrimis potest? Si tot fuerunt martyres, integer ecclesiæ numerus multo major fuerit necesse est: sanguine enim martyrum semper crescit ecclesia.

[r] Spond. an. 1713, n. vii. Quod Albigenses spectat, quum circa hæc tempora in Galliis illi et Hispaniis . . . nimium exagitati, pars in fines Bulgarorum, Croatiæ, et Dalmatiæ juxta Hungariam abscedentes, nonnullis episcopis et quam plurimis aliis in suas partes allectis, etiam Antipapam constituissent, ad quem undique consultationes suas deferrent; isque vices suas in Galliis Bartholomæo cuidam Carcassone oriundo, episcopo a se creato, delegasset, qui . . . episcopos suæ sectæ creandi atque ecclesias ordinandi auctoritatem sibi arrogabat, &c.

Digitized by Google

the Bohemians in the last age, who tells us a remarkable story,[s] "How the Bohemians, being in some distress for want of bishops, sent three of their ministers, Matthias Kunwaldius, Thomas Przelaucius, and Elias Krzenovius, to the Waldenses, dispersed throughout Austria and Moravia, to have them ordained bishops; which was accordingly done by Stephen and another bishop of the Waldenses, with some presbyters joined with them. These three were ordained bishops by them, and sent back to Bohemia again: and from thence came the succession of Catholic bishops in Bohemia, which continued to the final extirpation of them in the last age, by the ill success of the Bohemian war, and the prevalency of the popish faction." These are most undeniable proofs that the Waldenses, or Albigenses, had always bishops among them; and they did not derive their authority from the pope, but had it originally among themselves, handed down from the time of Constantine, as they themselves declared to the Bohemians,[t] when they ordained their ministers bishops in the forementioned congress. And this agrees exactly with the account, which even Rainerius, a popish writer, but something more ingenuous than the common railers of that party, gives of them. "Among all the sects," says he,[u] "that are, or ever

[s] Histor. Persecut. Eccles. Bohem. c. xx. pp. 68, 70, 71. Bohemis maximam aliquando fuisse anxietudinem de animarum pastoribus, unde hos essent habituri, postquam, quos haberent in præsens, decessuri essent. Misisse igitur tres de ministris suis, Matthiam Kunwaldium, Thomam Przelaucium, et Eliam Krzenovium ad Waldenses, qui tum essent in confiniis Moraviæ et Austriæ, ut eos episcopos ordinarent. Invenisse illos episcopum eorum Stephanum, qui, accito episcopo altero et aliquot e ministris, tribus illis ministros creandi potestate collata, manuum impositione eos episcopos crearit, et ad suos remiserit.

[t] Ibid. p. 71. Originem suam usque a Constantini temporibus, doctrinæ item suæ articulos, et quid hactenus horrendi per Italiam et Galliam passi essent, explicant.

[u] Rainer. cont. Waldens. c. iv. cited by Crakanthorp. cont. Spalat. c. xviii. p. 100, et in Bibl. Patr. tom. iv. part. ii. p. 749. Inter omnes sectas, quæ adhuc sunt vel fuerunt, non est perniciosior ecclesiæ, quam Leonistarum. Et hoc tribus de causis. Prima est, quia est diuturnior. Aliqui enim dicunt, quod duraverit a tempore Silvestri: aliqui a tempore apostolorum. Secunda, quia est generalior: fere enim nulla est terra, in qua hæc secta non sit. Tertia, quia quum omnes aliæ sectæ immanitate blasphemiarum in Deum audientibus horrorem inducant, hæc, scilicet Leonistarum, magnam habet speciem pietatis, eo quod

Digitized by Google

were, there is not a more pernicious one to the Church of God, than that of the poor men of Lyons; and that for three reasons: 1. Because it was more ancient; for some said it had continued from the time of Pope Silvester, and others from the time of the apostles. 2. Because it was more universal; for there was no nation almost where this sect had not some footing. 3. Because all other sects were accompanied with horrible blasphemies against God, which would make a man tremble; but this of the Leonists had a great show of piety: they lived uprightly before men, and believed all things aright of God, and all the articles contained in the Creed. Only they blasphemed and hated the Church of Rome." These were those ancient, numerous, and pious members of the Catholic Church, governed by a college of Catholic bishops from the time of Constantine, and so from the time of the apostles, with whom the Church of England had to join in communion at the time of her Reformation from the errors and heresies of popery. Which being so, I cannot but stand amazed at the attempt of Mr. Collier, and wonder at his design in his late History of the Church of England, where he goes about industriously and partially to represent the black part of the character of the Albigenses from the calumnies and slanders of their adversaries,[w] without suggesting the least tittle of what so many learned men have said, or what may be said, in their vindication. This was not acting fairly the part of a historian, much less the part of a friend to the Church of England, to rob her of the testimony and confession of so considerable a body of worthy patriots and martyrs, in whose communion (as I have shewed), she had so particular an interest in almost all the steps and measures of her Reformation. And now that I have said this, I cannot but note one thing more in this author, which looks not well in a Protestant writer; that is, his account of the Lutherans and Calvinists (in his late Supplement to the Historical

coram hominibus juste vivant, et bene omnia de Deo credant, et omnes articulos qui in symbolo continentur. Solummodo Romanam ecclesiam blasphemant et clerum.

[w] Collier. Eccles. Histor. lib. v. p. 388, &c.

Digitized by Google

Dictionary), both which are taken from the history of Maimbourg, their professed enemy: — when yet he could not be ignorant what an excellent vindication of the Lutherans had been written against Maimbourg, by the noble and learned Seckendorf; to which he refers his reader upon some other occasions; which shews that he was no stranger to it. But this only by the way. I now return to the history of the ancient Church.

## SECT. XXIV. — *Of the Baptism of Turks, Jews, and Infidels.*

The last question is concerning the baptism of such as are wholly out of the Church, and in no sense Christians, such as Turks, Jews, and infidels: Whether baptism administered by any of these in the form of the Church, be to be reputed valid as well as others? I had not mentioned this question, but only because the Church of Rome has carried the matter so far as to affirm it, contrary to the judgment and practice of all the ancient Church: for in her Ritual of Baptism she has this rubric or direction,[x] "That though the ordinary minister of baptism be only a priest or a deacon: yet, in case of necessity, it may be done not only by a layman, or woman, that is a Catholic, but by a Jew, a pagan, or an infidel." And so Pope Nicholas,[y] in the canon law, and Eugenius, in the Council of Florence,[z] magisterially determined. But this is one of the novelties of popery; for the

[x] Ritual. Roman. Titul. de Ministro Baptismi, (Romæ, 1816, p. 11.) Legitimus quidem baptismi minister est [episcopus] parochus, vel alius sacerdos a parocho, vel ab Ordinario loci delegatus; sed quoties infans aut adultus versatur in vitæ periculo, potest sine solennitate a quocumque baptizari in qualibet lingua, sive clerico, sive laico etiam excommunicato, sive fideli, sive infideli, sive Catholico, sive hæretico, sive viro, sive fœmina, servata tamen forma et intentione ecclesiæ.

[y] Nicol. Respons. ad Consulta Bulgaror. c. civ. apud Gratian. de Consecrat. dist. iv. c. xxiv. A quodam Judæo, nescitis utrum Christiano an pagano, multos in patria vestra baptizatos asseritis, et quid de iis sit agendum, consulitis. Hi profecto si in nomine sanctæ Trinitatis, vel tantum in Christi nomine, sicut in Actibus Apostolorum legimus, baptizati sunt (unum quippe idemque est, ut Sanctus exponit Ambrosius) constat eos non esse denuo baptizandos.

[z] Eugen. Decret. ad Armenos, Conc. tom. xiii. p. 535. In causa necessitatis non solum sacerdos vel diaconus, sed etiam laicus vel mulier, immo etiam paganus et hæreticus, baptizare potest, dummodo formam servet ecclesiæ.

Digitized by Google

ancients spake in another style. St. Jerome[a] professes himself amazed to hear a Luciferian say, "A man might be made a Christian by one who himself was in no sense a Christian;" which the Luciferians were forced to assert upon their principles, who received the baptism of the Arians, and yet maintained that they were mere pagans who administered it: which St. Jerome justly exposes as a strange paradox in Christianity, that Christian baptism might be given by men who themselves were no Christians. And this shews the true state of the controversy between St. Jerome and the Luciferians. It was not, Whether laymen might baptize in case of necessity, as some have imagined; for, upon this point, both sides were agreed: but it was, first, Whether the Arian priests were mere heathens? Which the Luciferians affirmed, and St. Jerome denied. And then, secondly, Whether, supposing them to be mere heathens, as the Luciferians would have it, their baptism was valid, and ought not to be repeated again? The Luciferians asserted it to be valid, notwithstanding the supposition of their being heathens: but St. Jerome refutes their assertion upon this principle, that none but a Christian could give Christian baptism; and, therefore, the Luciferians ought either to own, as the Catholics did, that the Arians were in some sense Christians, and not mere pagans; or else to rebaptize those that were baptized by them, since pagans could have no manner of power to give Christian baptism. Tertullian, and the Council of Eliberis, were of the same opinion: for they only plead for the validity of such baptisms as were administered by Christians. And St. Austin says,[b] "It was a very different question from that of lay-baptism, and that nothing ought to be determined in favour of it without the authority of a general council." Nicephorus, among

[a] Hieron. Dial. adv. Lucifer. c. v. (Venet. Vallars. vol. ii. p. 184, A. 4.) Novam rem asseris, ut Christianus quisquam factus sit ab eo, qui non fuit Christianus.

[b] Aug. cont. Parmen. lib. ii. c. xiii. (Bened. 1700, vol. ix. p. 30, C.) Hæc quidem alia quæstio est, utrum et ab iis qui numquam fuerunt Christiani, possit baptismus dari: nec aliquid temere inde adfirmandum est sine auctoritate tanti concilii, quantum tantæ rei sufficiat.—Id. de Baptismo, lib. vii. c. liii. fere tot.

Digitized by Google

the Greeks, declares positively,[c] "That no man can baptize others who is not first baptized himself as a Christian." And Pope Gregory III. is alleged by some for the same opinion. So that the determination of the Romish Church, for the validity of baptism administered by Jews and pagans is wholly new, and utterly without precedent in the Primitive Church. The authors of the *Chronicon Alexandrinum* and *Ado Viennensis*, indeed, give an instance or two of persons who were baptized by heathens, in mockery, upon the stage, who are also said to have been converted, and suffered martyrdom upon it: but these effects were owing to the miraculous grace of God, and not to any such baptism; and, therefore, these instances may serve to prove the power of martyrdom, which may save men without baptism; but are of no weight to justify the modern practice.

I have now gone through the several questions at first proposed, so far as relates to the judgment and practice of the Primitive Church.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### THE PRACTICE OF THE MODERN GREEKS AND MOSCOVITES.

#### SECT. I. — *The Practice of the Modern Greek Church.*

PROCEED we now to inquire into the sense and practice of the Church in latter ages. And here I shall say nothing more of the Western or Latin Church, because its practice is so generally known and uncontested. In the Greek Church there has been some dispute about this matter, and some seeming variation in the decrees of their councils, though they have more generally agreed with the Latins so far, as to allow the baptism of laymen in cases of extreme necessity; which is now also their common practice. In the time of the patriarch Nicephorus, commonly called the Confessor,

[c] Niceph. Histor. lib. xi. c. xi. [Not. Græca verba desunt in hoc capite Nicephori.—Grischow.]

Digitized by Google

who lived in the beginning of the ninth century, about fifty years before Photius, it was synodically determined to be lawful: for in Harmenopulus's Epitome of the Canons, and the collection of synodical decrees of the Greek patriarchs, published by Leunclavius in his *Jus Græco-Romanum*, there are two canons of Nicephorus to this purpose: in one of which it is said,[a] "That if there happen to be infants found in a place where there is no priest, they ought to be baptized: and if in that case the father baptizes his own child, or any other man, provided only that he be a Christian, it is no sin." In the other canon he says,[b] "In case of necessity, a simple monk, that is, one who is no priest, may baptize: as also a deacon and a layman, if it be in a place where there is no priest." And thus matters seem to have stood also in the time of Photius, who, among all the objections that he raises against the Roman Church, in his famous encyclical epistle, never so much as touches upon this point; which probably he would have done, had there been any difference between them. Yet some private writers, about this time, began to dispute the legality of lay-baptism, and call in question the Church's practice. Georgius Hamartolus, a chronographer not yet extant in print, about the year 840, made a bitter invective against it; for the knowledge of which we are beholden to the curious industry of Cotelerius, who has published a fragment out of that writer relating to this subject. He tells us, that author having occasion to mention the case of the Jew that was baptized in sand, makes this reflection on it:[c] "Where now are those who

[a] Ap. Leunclav. Jur. Gr. Rom. lib. iii. p. 169. Χρὴ τὰ ἀζάπτιστα νήπια, ἐὰν εὑρεθῇ τις εἰς τόπον, μὴ ὄντος ἱερέως, βαπτισθῆναι. Εἰ βαπτίσει δὲ ὁ ἴδιος πατὴρ, ἢ οἱονδήποτε ἄνθρωπος, μόνον ἵνα ἐστὶ Χριστιανὸς, οὐκ ἔστιν ἁμαρτία.

[b] Harmenop. Epitom. can. sect. iv. tit. ii. apud Leunclav. p. 44. Κατὰ περίστασιν καὶ μοναχὸς λιτὸς βαπτίζει, ὡσαύτως καὶ διάκονος· καὶ λαϊκὸς δὲ, ἐὰν εὑρεθῇ εἰς τόπον, μὴ ὄντος ἱερέως.

[c] Coteler. Not. in Constitut. Apost. lib. iii. c. ix. Ποῦ νῦν εἰσιν οἱ κοσμικούς τινας καὶ γυναῖκας λίγοντες βαπτίσαι ποτὲ κατὰ περίστασιν, μὴ παρόντος ἱερέως, καὶ εἰς βάπτισμα θεῖον καὶ τέλειον αὐτοῖς λογισθῆναι φιλονικοῦντες, μᾶλλον δὲ περιτολογοῦντες καὶ βλασφημοῦντες ἐκ πολλῆς ἀγνωσίας καὶ αὐθαδείας· μὴ δὲ τῆς ἱερᾶς τῶν ἀποστόλων διδασκαλίας καὶ παραγγελίας ἀκούοντες, τῆς λεγούσης, Οὐκ ἐπιτρέπομεν λαϊκὸν ποιεῖν τι τῶν ἱερατικῶν, οἷον θυσίαν ἢ βάπτισμα, ἢ χειροθεσίαν, ἢ εὐλογίαν μικρὰν ἢ μεγάλην. οὐχ ἑαυτῷ γάρ τις λαμβάνει τὴν τιμὴν, ἀλλ' ὁ

Digitized by Google

say, that laymen and women may baptize sometimes in cases of necessity; and that contend, through ignorance, and prodigious and pervicacious impiety, that such baptism ought to be reputed as perfect and Divine? Who pay no regard to the doctrine and command of the apostles (meaning the book which goes under the name of the Apostolical Constitutions), which says, 'We do not permit a layman to perform any sacerdotal office, as the oblation of the eucharist, or baptism, or imposition of hands, or the greater or the lesser benediction: for no one takes to himself this honour, but he that is called of God. For this dignity or authority is given by the imposition of hands of the bishop: but he that assumes this power as a usurper and invader, will incur the crime, and become liable to the punishment, of Saul and Ozias. Nor do we only prohibit laymen, but the rest of the clergy, to confer baptism, as deacons, readers, singers, and subdeacons: allowing it only to bishops and presbyters, who are to have the deacons attend upon them: and they who presume to do otherwise, shall suffer the punishment of Korah and his company.' It is, therefore, vain cavilling," says our author, "or rather fighting against God, to speak more truly, in such as confer the gifts and operations of the priesthood upon laymen and women, to the subversion of their hearers, who lend an ear to the vain and empty discourses of men, who know not what the priesthood means, or what difference there is between a priest and a layman." This writer seems either not to have known the forementioned decrees of Nicephorus, or else to contemn and insult them: for he sets himself wholly to oppose both the doctrine

καλούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Διὰ γὰρ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ ἐπισκόπου δίδοται ἡ τοιαύτη δόξα (al. ἐξουσία) ὁ δὲ μὴ ἐγχειρισθεὶς ταύτην, ἀλλ' ἁρπάσας καὶ συρραπίσας αὐτὴν ἑαυτῷ, τὴν ἁμαρτίαν καὶ τὴν τιμωρίαν τοῦ Σαοὺλ καὶ Ὀζίᾳ (al. Ὀζίου) ὑποστήσεται· οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τοῖς λοιποῖς κληρικοῖς ἐπιτρέπομεν βαπτίζειν, οἷον διακόνοις, ἢ ἀναγνώσταις, ἢ ψάλταις, ἢ ὑπηρέταις, ἢ μὴ [ἀλλ' ἢ] μόνοις ἐπισκόποις καὶ πρεσβυτέροις ἐξυπηρετουμένοις αὐτοῖς τῶν διακόνων· οἱ δὲ τολμῶντες τοῦτο, τῶν Κορισταῖων ὑποίσουσι τὴν δίκην. . . . Μάτην οὖν ἱερισχιλοῦσιν, ἢ τόγε ἀληθέστερον εἰπεῖν, θεομαχοῦσι, οἱ τὰ τῆς ἱερωσύνης χαρίσματα καὶ ἐνεργήματα κοσμικοῖς τε καὶ γυναιξὶν (al. κοσμικοῖς ἀνδράσι καὶ γυναιξὶν) ἀπονέμοντες ἐπὶ καταστροφῇ τῶν ἀκουόντων, καὶ πειθομένων τῇ ματαιολογίᾳ καὶ φλοιαρίᾳ (al. φλυαρίᾳ) τῶν μηδὲ ὁτί ποτέ ἐστιν ἱερωσύνη καὶ διαφορὰ κοσμικοῦ τε καὶ ἱερέως πάμπαν εἰδότων.

Digitized by Google

and practice authorized by them, and argues as much against the validity of baptism, when ministered by deacons in cases of necessity, as by laymen. Yet, notwithstanding his opposition, these canons continued in force among the Greeks for some ages after: for Harmenopulus, who lived in the middle of the twelfth century, and wrote his Epitome of the Greek Canons about the year 1150, has inserted them both into his collection: and they are the only canons that are mentioned upon this subject; which seems to argue, that they were then the standing rule of the Greek Church. Yet there were some who made opposition to them in this age also: for Michael Glycas, who wrote his Annals about the year 1120, takes occasion to urge several arguments against the validity of lay-baptism in any cases of necessity whatsoever. But, as Cotelerius has observed,[d] his arguments are grounded upon several mistakes in matters of fact, which makes them weak and inconclusive: first, he urges the example of Dionysius,[e] bishop of Ascalon, who is said to have rebaptized a man, who had been baptized in sand, instead of water, by a layman. But here wanted an essential part of baptism, viz. the element of water, which seems to have been the true reason why the party was rebaptized, if the whole story be not a fiction. In the next place, he alleges the authority of the Apostolical Canons, prohibiting laymen to meddle with the priest's office, whatever cases of necessity may seem to require it. And yet the case of necessity is never so much as once mentioned in all the Apostolical Canons or Consti-

[d] Coteler. Not. in Constitut. Apost. lib. iii. c. ix. In Annalibus Michaëlis Glycæ, pp. 243, 244, pro falsa ea opinione profertur primo factum Dionysii præsulis, qui baptizatum a laico baptizavit iterum. Narratio incerta, nec ad rem pertinens, quia baptismus arena non aqua peractus dicitur. . . . Profertur secundo auctoritas Canonum Apostolicorum, laicis prohibentium sacerdotalia munia, etiamsi necessitas ingruat. Cum in toto hoc opere ne verbum quidem de necessitate: solummodo a sacris functionibus arcetur plebs, lib. ii. c. xxvii.; lib. iii. c. x.; et lib. ult. c. xlvi. Additur in Glyca ex Vita S. Athanasii, pueros per Athanasium puerum baptizatos, ab Alexandro Alexandrino rebaptizatos fuisse. Verum biographus iste . . . videtur non intellexisse hæc verba antiquioris biographi apud Photium Cod. cclviii. Τούτους ἐπιχρίσας, διὰ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ σφραγίδος ἐτελείωσεν: quæ exponi debent de consignatione et confirmatione, non autem de baptismo, &c. (Antuerp. 1698, vol. i. p. 283.)

[e] Glycas, Annal. pp. 243, 244. See preceding note.



Digitized by Google

tutions: only laymen are severely prohibited, in general, from thrusting themselves into the offices of the ecclesiastical function. Thirdly, he argues from the authority of Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, who, he says, rebaptized the children that had been baptized by Athanasius. But this is directly contrary to all the old historians, Socrates, Sozomen, and Rufinus, who say expressly that Alexander did not rebaptize them, but only added what was wanting, and what belonged to the episcopal office to perform; that is, imposition of the bishop's hands, with the unction or chrism of confirmation. And so the author of the Life of Athanasius, in Photius, is to be understood, when he says,[f] that Alexander gave them the unction, and perfected them by the seal or consignation of Christ: which Glycas mistook for the seal of baptism, instead of confirmation, being led into that error by some modern biographer, who understood not the truth of the story, nor the ancient language of the Church, in which the word σφραγὶς signifies not only the 'seal of baptism,' but that of 'confirmation' also. About a hundred years after Glycas, lived one Theodorus Scutariota, who wrote some *scholia*, or 'annotations,' upon Nicetas Choniates's *Thesaurus Orthodoxæ Fidei;* where he also maintains the invalidity of lay-baptism, as Cotelerius[g] informs us, who had seen the manuscript: for the work itself was never yet made public. But all these were but private writers hitherto, and therefore signify little to oppose their own private opinions to the declared sense of the Church, as it was authentically delivered in the canons of Nicephorus, made in a patriarchal council, where two hundred and seventy bishops were present, if the Council of Constantinople (an. 814) was the council in which those canons were made. That which seems to carry more weight with it, to bear down the aforesaid authority, is another decree made in the Council of Constantinople, under Lucas Chrysoberges, the patriarch (an. 1166). Here the question was put by Manuel, archbishop of Heraclea, Whether a man

[f] Phot. Cod. cclviii. p. 229. See before, note (d).

[g] Coteler. Not. in Constitut. Apost. lib. iii. c. ix. p. 283.

Digitized by Google

ought to be received as a Christian, who was baptized by one who pretended to be a priest, but was not so? For such a case had lately happened in his diocese.[h] In answer to this, the synod decreed that such ought to be rebaptized; because the administration of baptism is only committed to bishops and priests, according to the forty-sixth and forty-seventh Canons of the Apostles. This Council cannot be denied to speak plainly against the validity of lay-baptism, and in favour of rebaptization, in the case that was then laid before them; which was the ordinary ministration of baptism by such as counterfeited orders, and pretended to be priests when they were not so. But, whether they intended by this wholly to invalidate the baptism of deacons and laymen in extraordinary cases of absolute necessity, when neither a bishop nor presbyter can be had,—as they have not expressed themselves particularly upon this point,—so it is more than I can pretend positively, from their words, to determine. But if it was so, then I can say, it was plainly contrary to the decrees of the former Council, under Nicephorus, which prevailed in practice both before and since this Council, and still does in the Greek Church to this day; however some learned persons, for want of a little better inquiry, have suffered themselves to be led into an error in thinking otherwise: for the best Greek writers of late days, in speaking of the minister of baptism, and the practice of their Church, always except the case of extreme necessity, in which they allow a layman or woman to baptize, rather than suffer a child to die without baptism. Nothing can be plainer than the answer which Jeremy, the late patriarch of Constantinople, gave to the divines of Tubing, Jacobus Andreas and Martin Crusius, in the last age, when they had sent him the Augsburg Confession, and desired his sentiments about it. In the point of ministering baptism, he

[h] Conc. Constantin. apud Matth. Blastar. Syntag. can. in Bevereg. Pand. tom. ii. p. 42. Ἐζητήθη καὶ τοῦτο τοῦ Ἡρακλείας ἱερωμένου Μανουὴλ, εἰ χρὴ δέχεσθαι ὡς πιστὸν, ὃν ἀνίερος ἱερᾶσθαι πλασάμενος. Τοῦτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀνορίας αὐτοῦ τεθνικαῦτα συνέζη. Καὶ ἐψηφίσατο ἡ σύνοδος, καὶ τούτους ἀναβαπτίζεσθαι· ἐπεὶ γάρ φησι κατὰ τοὺς τῶν ἀποστόλων κανόνας, τὸν μϛ, καὶ μζ. μόνοις ἐπισκόποις ἐδόθη καὶ ἱερεῦσιν ἡ τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος τιλιστή.

Digitized by Google

thus expresses himself, according to Socolovius's translation:[i] "The instrumental cause of baptism is a priest, unless a sudden necessity require it to be otherwise; in which case baptism conferred by one that is not a priest, is valid." Hottinger takes notice of the same answer, and gives us his words from the original, which are,[k] "That when a case of necessity happens, they esteem it lawful for laymen to baptize." And Hottinger observes further, that though the patriarch expressed his dissent from the Lutheran divines in some other points, yet upon this head, and many others, there was a perfect agreement between them: for the Lutheran Churches, as we shall see more hereafter, are all for the validity of baptism, when administered in cases of necessity by laymen. As to the practice of the present Greek Church, we have further evidence from what Suicerus[l] has observed out of Metrophanes Critopulus, a late writer of that communion, who wrote the Confession of the Oriental Church, where he thus expresses himself concerning baptism in such cases:[m] "When a pressing necessity requires, the infant is baptized immediately after its birth: and if a presbyter be not at hand, the midwife does it. If the child recover, this baptism is reckoned sufficient for him." Arcudius has the like remark,[n] out of Gabriel Severus, archbishop of Philadelphia, in his book of the Sacraments of the Church, where he says,[o] "That when a priest cannot be present, a lay-Christian, man or woman, may baptize." And the learned Dr. Smith, who has lately written of the

[i] Jerem. ad Germanos, apud Socolov. Censur. Ecclesiæ Oriental. c. vii. p. 111. Instrumentalis causa sacerdos est, nisi quid aliud præceps necessitas exposcat: nam et tum ab alio quam a sacerdote collatus baptismus vim suam retinet.

[k] Ibid. apud Hottinger. Hist. Eccles. tom. i. p. 632. Ἀνάγκης δὲ κατεπειγούσης, καὶ τοῖς λαϊκοῖς βαπτίζειν ἐξεῖναι.

[l] Suicer. Thesaur. Eccles. tom. i. p. 632.

[m] Metroph. Critopul. Confess. Eccles. Oriental. c. vii. p. 87. Ἀνάγκης δὲ κατεπειγούσης, εὐθὺς μετὰ τὴν γένεσιν βαπτίζεται τὸ γεννηθὲν κἂν πρεσβύτερος μὴ πάρεστιν, ἡ μαῖα τοῦτο ποιεῖ. . . . Εἰ δὲ τὸ βρέφος ἀναῤῥωθῇ, ἀρκεσθήσεται τούτῳ τῷ βαπτίσματι.

[n] Arcud. de Concord. Eccles. Orient. et Occid. lib. i. c. xi. p. 34.

[o] Gabr. Sever. de Sacram. c. de Baptismo. Μὴ παρόντος ἱερέως, δύναται βαπτίζειν καὶ λαϊκὸς Χριστιανὸς, ἄντε γυνὴ, ἄντε ἄῤῥην.

Digitized by Google

present state of the Greek Church, gives us this account of their practice from one of their public confessions of faith, written in the vulgar Greek, and printed in the year 1662, where it is expressly said,[p] "That it is not lawful and proper for any one to baptize but a lawful priest, except in time of necessity; and then a secular person, whether man or woman, may do it." So that what Bishop Taylor, in his *Ductor Dubitantium*,[q] has alleged out of Symeon, archbishop of Thessalonica, declaring, "That no man baptizes but he that is in holy orders," is either to be understood in the same manner, with the limitation and exception of the time of necessity, or else to be rejected as false; since there are so many plain and undeniable evidences of their practice to the contrary, that he must outface the sun at noon-day, that will pretend to withstand them. This answer was given by Arcudius[r] to this passage of Symeon long before Bishop Taylor wrote; but they neither of them refer us to Symeon's book, whence it is taken. I suppose it to be his book of the Sacraments of the Church; whence, Socolovius says, the patriarch Jeremy took his account of baptism: and, if so, it is more than probable they were of the same mind in this matter. But till I can see the book itself, I will not be positive, but rest satisfied with the answer given by Arcudius, as a just reply to this exception.

## SECT. II.— *The Practice of the Moscovites.*

The Moscovites commonly follow the practice of the Greeks, as having been first converted to Christianity by them, and still continuing to be of their communion and

[p] Smith's Account of the Greek Church, London, 1680, p. 109. To prevent which mischief, and secure their fears, where there is a certain and real danger of imminent death, in the absence of a priest, who is, at all other times, the only lawful minister of this sacred rite, it is allowed to lay persons, of either sex, as it is expressly laid down in their public confession of faith, written in the vulgar Greek, and printed in the year 1662. Τὸ διατεταγμένον βάπτισμα δὲν πρέπει, νὰ γίνεται ἀπὸ ἄλλον τινὰ παρὰ ἀπὸ τὸν νόμιμον ἱερέα, μὰ εἰς καιρόν τινος ἀνάγκης ἠμπορεῖ νὰ κάμῃ τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο καὶ κοσμικὸν πρόσωπον ἀνδρὸς ἢ γυναικός.

[q] Taylor, Duct. Dubit. book iii. chap. iv. rule xv. (London, 1839, 8vo. vol. xiv. p. 49.)

[r] Arcud. de Concord. Eccles. Orient. et Occid. lib. i. c. xi. p. 28.

Digitized by Google

religion. Whence one might probably conclude, that their sentiments and practice, in this point, were agreeable to those of the Greek Church, though there were no further evidence for it. But their rules and canons give particular orders about this matter, as the learned Gerhard, who was acquainted with them, assures us; for he says,[s] "The first canon of John, their metropolitan, who is commonly called their prophet, gives this direction, 'That children, in case of necessity, should be baptized without a priest.'" The people, indeed, do not always observe this rule: for some authors tell us,[t] many of them think a priest so absolutely requisite to perform this office, that whatever case of necessity happen, they will not permit it to be done by any other but a priest. But we are to judge of the sense and practice of a Church, from the rules and canons made by its governors, and not by the practice of the vulgar, who often transgress their rules, either through ignorance, neglect, or contempt: in which case, it would be injurious to any Church to judge of her doctrines by the contrary practice of the common people.

---

## CHAPTER III.

### THE PRACTICE OF THE CHURCHES OF THE REFORMATION.

### SECT. I.— *The Practice of the Lutherans.*

NEXT for the Churches of the Reformation. The Lutherans, in all nations, allow of the baptism of lay-persons, men and women, in cases of absolute necessity. We have heard before, out of Hottinger, that the German divines of Tubing, who were Luther's disciples, and of the Augsburg Confession, agreed perfectly upon this head with the Greek Church: and it is further evident from the works of the

[s] Gerhard. loc. Commun. tom. iv. de Baptismo, n. xxxvii. p. 241. Primus canon Joannis, metropolitæ, eorum dicti prophetæ, pueros quoque jubet in necessitate absque sacerdote baptizari, p. 24.

[t] Jo. Fabri. de Relig. Moscov. p. 176. Huic muneri fungendo, quæcumque necessitas inciderit, nemo hominum sufficere putatur, nisi sacerdos exstiterit.

Digitized by Google

most celebrated writers of that way, both in Germany and Denmark. Some of their professors have particular dissertations upon this subject, where they both assert the grounds of their own Church's practice, and reply to all the objections that are made to the contrary. It will be sufficient to refer the reader to two of them at present, Brochmand and Gerhard, whereof the one was professor of divinity at Copenhagen, in Denmark; and the other, at Jena, in Saxony. Brochmand, in his Body of Divinity, lays down this assertion as the doctrine and rule of the Church :[a] "That any person who is a Christian, man or woman, may be the extraordinary minister of baptism, at least in the case of extreme necessity, when there is imminent danger of death, and a minister of the word cannot be had." He considers four of the principal objections to the contrary, and gives them these short answers.[b] Objection 1. That the administration of the sacrament is part of the ecclesiastical ministry (Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark, xvi. 15). Objection 2. That it is not permitted to a woman to teach in the church (1 Tim. ii. 12). To these two objections he returns the same answer, "That, in case of extreme necessity, every private person is permitted to teach and administer baptism." For he supposes those rules to relate only to the public and standing ministry in ordinary cases. To a third objection, That no private person is authorized to administer the Lord's supper, he replies, "That there is not commonly the same extreme necessity in the one as in the other; and that makes some disparity between baptism and the Lord's supper." To the last objection, That women's baptism was introduced first

[a] Brochmand. System. Theol. tom. ii. de Baptismo, c. v. sect. iii. p. 418, (p. 2007, edit. Hafn. 1633.) Extraordinarius baptismi administer, saltem in extremo necessitatis casu, ubi præsentissima mors imminet, et verbi minister haberi non potest, quivis homo Christianus esse potest, sive sit mas sive femina.

[b] Ibid. c. vi. p. 432, (p. 2046, edit. cit.) Cuivis homini privato, etiam mulieri, permissum esse, in extremo necessitatis casu, ut doceat et administret baptismum. . . . Non licere ulli privato administrare sacram cœnam; disparem esse baptismi et sacræ cœnæ necessitatem: illum omnibus necessarium esse, qui eum habere potuerint sive per ordinarium sive per extraordinarium administrum, Joh. iii. 6: hanc vero non nisi ab illis usurpari debere, qui se ipsos probare apti sint, 1 Cor. xi. 18, &c. . . . Marcionitas quibusvis concessisse licentiam baptizandi, quod ecclesiæ Lutheranæ non probent.

Digitized by Google

by Marcion the heretic, he answers: "That the Marcionites granted a promiscuous liberty to any persons to baptize in any case, which their churches did by no means approve or allow." Gerhard is more copious upon this subject: first, he lays down their doctrine in this assertion,[c] "That though the administration of baptism ordinarily belongs to the ministers of the Church; yet, in extraordinary cases of extreme necessity, when one of these two things must needs be, that either an infant must die without baptism, or else baptism must be conferred upon it by a private person; in such an exigency, they hold that baptism may be administered in a private house, by any Christian that is rightly instructed in the articles of religion, without distinction of sex." Then he proceeds to assign the grounds of this assertion, where he argues, first, upon the necessity of baptism, from the words of our Saviour: "Except a man be born again of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;" and urges, "That this necessity is not in respect of God, who is not so tied to the sacrament that he cannot regenerate without it; but in respect of us, upon whom there lies a necessity of observing the Divine command, about administering baptism, wheresoever the

[c] Gerhard. loc. Commun. de Bapt. n. xxxiv. tom. iv. p. 239, (Genev. 1639, vol. iii. p. 442.) Quamvis baptismi administratio ordinarie pertineat ad ecclesiæ ministros; extraordinarie tamen in extremo necessitatis casu, quando hoc immediatum disjunctum obtinet, aut infantulo absque baptismo moriendum, aut baptismus a privata persona ei conferendus, in hoc, inquam, necessitatis casu privatis in ædibus a quovis Christiano, in articulis religionis recte instituto, citra sexus respectum baptismum administrari posse statuimus. . . . Ubicunque ergo substantialia baptismi haberi possunt, ibi baptismus infantulo conferendus, ne quantum in nobis est, a mediis salutis ipsum arceamus; quamvis autem ex hypothesi non adsit ordinarius ecclesiæ minister, non tamen omittenda baptismi administratio, quia ad substantialia baptismi nequaquam requiritur, ut is qui hoc sacramentum dispensat, sit minister ecclesiæ; proinde necessitati hac in parte cedit ordo. Excipiunt qui nobis hic adversantur, 'Virtutem Divinam regenerandi non esse sacramento baptismi adligatam; quum Deus etiam absque baptismo possit hominem regenerare.' *Resp.* Necessitatem heic intelligimus non respectu Dei, sed respectu nostri. Quamvis enim Deus non ita sit adligatus huic sacramento, quo minus etiam citra illud in casu necessitatis regenerare possit; nobis tamen incumbit necessitas Divino mandato de administrando baptismo, ubicunque ejusdem substantialia haberi possunt, obsequendi. . . . Circumcisio, urgente necessitate, potuit administrari ab hominibus privatis: ergo etiam baptismus in Novo Testamento, urgente necessitate,

Digitized by Google

substantial parts of it may be had, lest, as much as in us lies, we hinder an infant from the ordinary means of salvation. A public minister of the Church is not of the essence of the sacrament, but a matter of order, which is not so necessary as the sacrament itself; order being instituted for the sacrament, and not the sacrament for order: and therefore order is to give way to the sacrament, when necessity requires." 2d. He argues from the parallel case of circumcision, which in its first institution was appointed to be done by the master of the family only (Gen. xvii. 11, 23), yet in extraordinary cases of necessity it might be done by others, even by women, as by Zippora, when Moses was so discomposed and disabled that he could not perform it; and by other women, in the time of the Maccabees (1 Mac. i. 63; 2 Mac. vi. 10). 3d. He argues further, from the parallel case of absolution and teaching, which are the ordinary offices of the public ministers: "Yet in extraordinary cases, as in the time of a siege, or a plague, or a persecution, when the Church is destitute of ordinary pastors, a private

a privatis administrari poterit. Paritas probatur ex eo, 1. quia utrumque est initiationis sacramentum, circumcisio in Veteri, baptismus in Novo Testamento. 2. Quia baptismus in locum circumcisionis successit (Col. ii. 2). 3. Quia ut de circumcisione dicitur (Gen. xvii. 14): 'Masculi non circumcisi anima eradicabitur e populo suo:' ita quoque de baptismo pronuntiatur (Joann. iii. 5): 'Nisi quis renatus fuerit,' &c. Quin immo inest argumento quodammodo processus a fortiori: Si enim circumcisio a feminis non circumcisis, et quidem in loco pudoris, Israeliticis puerulis administrari potuit, quanto magis a privatis administrari poterit baptismus. Assumtum probatur (Exod. iv. 25): 'Occurrit Deus Mosi in via in diversorio, et voluit eum occidere' (lethalem illi immisit morbum propter omissam filioli circumcisionem): 'tulit ergo Zippora lapidem' (cultrum acutum, Jos. v. 2; Ps. cxxxix. 44), et circumcidit præputium filii sui, et tangens pedes ejus, dixit, 'Sponsus sanguinum mihi es.' 1 Macc. i. 63: 'Feminæ, quæ circumciderant pueros suos, juxta Antiochi mandatum occidebantur.' 2 Macc. vi. 10: 'Duæ mulieres adducebantur, propterea quod filios suos circumciderant.' . . . Ubi eadem ratio, ibi idem jus. Jam vero æqualis est ratio inter absolutionem, quam privatus quispiam morienti ex evangelio adnuntiat et inter baptismum, quem privatus in casu necessitatis confert, absente scilicet ordinario ecclesiæ ministro. Ergo idem etiam jus obtinet. Privati recte faciunt ecclesiam ordinario pastore destitutam, et homines ægrotos seu quovis modo adflictos ex verbo Dei instituentes et consolantes, ut tempore obsidionis, pestis, persecutionis. . . . Quare ergo privati in casu extremæ necessitatis non administrarent baptismum, quum itidem sint 'regale sacerdotium' (1 Pet. ii. 9); 'Facti coram Deo reges et sacerdotes' (Apoc. i. 6; v. 10).

Digitized by Google

person may declare absolution out of the word of God, to a dying man, and he may instruct and comfort the sick, or others that are under any affliction. In like manner, private men, in cases of extreme necessity, may administer baptism; they being also 'a royal priesthood' (1 Pet. ii. 9), and 'made kings and priests before God' (Rev. v. 10)." I examine not now what weight and force there is in these arguments, but only barely relate them as I find them in our author, to shew what were the common principles and practices of the Lutheran Churches.

## SECT. II.— *Of the Helvetic Churches.*

Another eminent branch of the Reformation are the Helvetic Churches, the followers of Zuinglius, whose doctrine upon this point differs but little from the Lutherans. The opinion of Zuinglius himself was altogether the same; for, in his book about Baptism, speaking of three several errors that had crept in among the circumstances of baptism, he reckons this one of them,[d] "That some thought baptism could not be conferred by any other but a priest only; whereas it might be given by any man in case of necessity, yea, by a woman also, if need required." But after the death of Zuinglius, in the general confession of the Helvetic Churches,[e] women were forbidden to baptize, because the apostle had commanded women not to meddle with ecclesiastical offices, of which baptism was one. But still no prohibition was laid upon men in cases of necessity, nor any order made for rebaptizing those who were irregularly baptized by others.

[d] Zuingl. de Baptismo, tom. ii. p. 96, *b*. Alter error circa personæ circumstantiam versabatur, quod baptismum a nemine alio, quam a solo sacerdote, conferri posse putarent: quum interim quivis hominum hoc facere possit, immo femina quoque, si quando necessitas sic postulare videatur.

[e] Confess. Helvet. c. xx. p. 70. Docemus baptismum in ecclesia non administrari debere a mulierculis vel ab obstetricibus. Paulus enim removet mulierculas ab ecclesiasticis officiis. Baptismus autem pertinet ad officia ecclesiastica.

Digitized by Google

## SECT. III. — *Of the Calvinists, and French and Dutch Churches.*

Our next inquiry is into the sense and practice of the French and Dutch Churches, which, in many things, took their measures from the sentiments of Calvin. Now Calvin freely declares his mind against the lawfulness of lay-baptism in any case whatsoever. He thinks there can be no necessity sufficient to authorize private men or women to do the office of a public minister. He owns, indeed, that the contrary practice had generally prevailed, not only several ages before his own time, but, in a manner, from the first beginning of the Church:[f] "Laymen always baptized in danger of death, if a minister could not be had in due time." But he thinks the grounds they went upon, were not justifiable. He does not peremptorily pronounce such baptisms absolutely null and void, but rather the contrary: for, as Archbishop Whitgift long ago observed, against his adversary Cartwright, Calvin was of opinion,[g] "That, as among men, if an epistle be sent, so as the hand and seal be known, it skilleth not who or what manner of person carrieth it; even so it is sufficient for us to know the hand and seal of the Lord in his sacraments, by whomsoever they be delivered. Hereby is the error of the Donatists confuted, who measured the virtue and worthiness of the sacrament, by the worthiness of the minister. Such be nowadays our Anabaptists, which deny us to be rightly baptized, because we were baptized by wicked and idolatrous persons in the pope's Church; and therefore they furiously urge rebaptization. Against whose folly we shall be sufficiently defended, if we think that we were baptized, not in the name of any man, but in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and therefore baptism not to be of man but of God, by

[f] Calvin. Instit. lib. iv. c. xv. n. xx. (Lugd. Bat. 1654, p. 473.) Multis abhinc sæculis, adeoque ab ipso fere ecclesiæ exordio usu receptum fuit, ut in periculo mortis laici baptizarent, si minister in tempore non adesset. Non video, quam firma ratione defendi queat.

[g] Whitgift's Defence of the Answer to the Admonit. Tract. ix. p. 518, ex Calvin. Institut. lib. iv. c. xv. n. xvi.

Digitized by Google

whomsoever it be ministered." This was the judgment of Calvin.

However Beza, his successor, declares positively, not only against the lawfulness, but the validity of baptism, administered by private persons, especially by women; which, he thinks, is no more to be regarded than what any private man does of his own head in the name of a king or a commonwealth; or than a counterfeit seal forged by a private man, and set to any instrument in imitation of the public. Yet he allows an essential part of baptism may be changed,[h] viz. the water, and any other liquor be used, rather than baptism should be deferred. Nay, and if Gerhard do not misrepresent him (for I have not Beza's book, which he quotes, at hand), he scruples not to affirm,[i] "That he should esteem the baptism of Satan in the ministry to be lawful." Which are pretty strange expressions to come from a man who thought it a profanation of baptism, and a mere nullity, to have it administered, in the most extreme necessity, by any private Christian. How far the French Churches vindicate Beza in those two latter assertions, at present, is not very material to inquire: but in the former, that is, in the doctrine of the invalidity and nullity of lay-baptism, it is certain they all join with him. At least from the time of the general Synod of Poictiers, 1560, they were all obliged to defend that doctrine by subscription. For in that synod the question was put,[j] "What was to be done, in case a child had been baptized by a private person?" And the answer was given, "That the baptism shall be declared null, and the child shall be brought publicly into

[h] Beza, Epist. ii. ad Tillium Tractat. Theol. vol. iii. p. 196. Desit etiam aqua, et tamen baptismus alicujus differri cum ædificatione non possit nec debeat: ego certo quovis alio liquore, non minus rite quam aqua baptizarim.

[i] Ibid. Quæst. cxliv. cit. Gerhardo loc. Commun. tom. iv. de Bapt. n. xxii. Ipsius Satanæ baptismum in ministerio non dubitanter se velle dicere legitimum, adserit.

[j] La Discipline des Eglises Reformées de France, c. xi. (p. 313, edit. Salmur. 1669, 12mo.) Au même synode on forma cette question, Comment on se porteroit, quand un enfant auroit été baptisé par un particulier? *Response.* Il faut ôter le scandale, qui en pourroit arriver par plusieurs prédications, et imprimer au cœur des fidèles, qu'un tel baptême n'est d'aucune valeur; pourquoy il faut introduire l'enfant dans l'église de Dieu par le vray baptême. (Amsterdam, 1710, p. 245.)

Digitized by Google

the church, there to receive true baptism." This was also inserted into their Book of Discipline, to which they all swear and subscribe (chap. ii. art. 1):[k] "That baptism, administered by an unordained person, is wholly void and null." The same resolution was given in many other national synods, as the first and second of Rochelle, 1571 and 1581; the Synod of Gap, 1603; and the Synod of Alençon, 1637. Where, though the king had sent them a letter, requiring them to reverse their decree, and allow of the baptism of women and others, according as is done in the Romish Church, yet they utterly refused to allow of any such baptism, as a thing formally contrary to their belief. This, then, is indisputably the practice of the French Church. But the observation a learned person makes upon it, is not very accurate: "That we may reasonably suppose, that all the other reformed Churches, who observe the same discipline, are of the same opinion:" for this is all supposition without proof. For no other Church that I know of, observes the same discipline with the French, which is peculiar to the French Church; and it is incongruous, then, to suppose that all the other reformed Churches observe the same discipline, when perhaps there is not one that does so. Neither are they all of the same opinion as to the particular case before us. For the Lutherans, as I have shewed, are all of the opposite side, and manage the contrary part of the question particularly against the followers of Calvin. Zuinglius also agreed with Luther; and the Helvetic Churches did not very much depart from his opinions. The Palatines, also, as I shall presently shew, thought that baptism administered by laymen, in a grand dissipation of the Church, was not to be repeated. And I believe neither the Waldenses, nor the Fratres Bohemi, have any different sentiments from the Lutherans upon this point, though I have not yet had opportunity to make an exact inquiry into their opinions. How, then, can it be supposed that all the reformed Churches beyond seas are of the same opinion with the

[k] Ibid. p. 312. Le baptême administré par celuy, qui n'a vocation aucune, est du tout nul.

Digitized by Google

French Church? I hope my ingenuous friend, when he sees this, will find it necessary, and becoming his wonted ingenuity, to retract his unguarded expression. To say, in a word, all that I know of this matter, the Dutch Church (though she does not observe the French discipline any more than any other of the reformed Churches) joins, I think, with the French Church in this particular, that the baptism of laymen is altogether null and void, and ought to be repeated. For though I have not any of her public acts or declarations to this purpose, yet I find the general current of her writers (the Arminians excepted) to run this way; and I suppose they speak the sense of their Church without any hesitation. So Rivet, Riissenius, Amesius, Vorstius, and others, with which I think it not necessary, in a plain case, to trouble the reader. But, then, the Dutch Church is far from being all the Churches of the Reformation: the Zuinglians are a considerable body; the Lutherans are much more so; being spread far and wide through many great and populous nations: and some of them are episcopal churches too, which allow this liberty in cases extraordinary to laymen. Whereas by some, the Dutch and French Churches are reckoned of no account, but unchurched, because they want episcopacy, and, consequently, true ordinations and Christian sacraments, in their opinion: and then what signifies their testimony in such a case, if, as soon as they have delivered their evidence about Christian baptism, they shall be cashiered, and positively declared to be no Christians? But I proceed to the remaining parts of the Reformation.

## SECT. IV. — *Of the Palatine Churches.*

The Churches of the Palatinate commonly follow the doctrine of the Calvinists; but, in one case, some of their divines make an exception, as in a time of great persecution or dispersion of the ministry in some grand dissipation of the Church. Which was a case that actually happened in the Palatinate by the wars in the last age, and gave occasion to Dr. Alting, professor of divinity at Heidelberg, to handle this question among his problems. The question

Digitized by Google

he puts in these terms, "Whether that baptism be lawful which is administered privately by private persons, men or women?" To this he returns answer in two distinct propositions: 1. "That baptism, administered privately by private persons, men or women, ought not to be esteemed lawful baptism." For which he assigns the common reasons that are usually alleged in this case: "1. Because it proceeds from a false opinion of the absolute necessity of baptism to salvation, as if an infant could not be saved without it. 2. Because baptism is not to be administered privately, but publicly in the sight of the whole Church, as being a part of the public ministry, and to avoid the magical ceremonies and superstitions of the Papists. 3. Because baptism belongs not to private men, but to those who are called to the ministry of the word. Which two things are joined together by Christ in the words of the institution, Matt. xxviii. 19. 4. Because women are expressly and by name excluded from all ministry of the word and sacraments (1 Cor. xiv. 34; 1 Tim. ii. 12)." But, notwithstanding the illegality of such baptism, he concludes in a second proposition against the repetition of it in case of a dissipation of the Church.[1] "Baptism," says he, "administered by private men in a grand dispersion of the Church, is not to be reiterated. We do not say it is legitimate or lawful; for we have shewed before, that it is faulty upon several accounts: but we say it is not to be repeated with this twofold condition or limitation: 1. That it be administered according

[1] Alting. Theol. Problemat. part. ii. quæst. xvi. p. 326. Baptismus, in dissipatione ecclesiæ, privatim a viro administratus, idque secundum institutionem Christi, non est repetendus. Eum non dicimus licitum aut legitimum esse; est enim trifariam vitiosus, ut ostendimus: sed non esse iterandum cum hac duplici conditione sive limitatione. 1. Si administratus sit juxta institutionem Christi: infante aqua adsperso in nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti. 2. Si id factum in dissipatione ecclesiæ: qualis nunc passim cernitur in Palatinatu. Si quidem illo ecclesiæ statu multa Deus condonat, quæ nullo modo admittere fas esset in ecclesia bene ordinata. Olim quum vitiata esset religio in populo Israel, haud dubie multis vitiis et corruptelis implicita fuit circumcisio, quam tamen iteratam fuisse non legimus, quum revocaretur populus ad purum cultum. Ita superiore sæculo, baptismus Papistarum fœdatus et vitiatus fuit multis superstitionibus, nec tamen repetitus in ecclesiis reformatis, quum secessio fieret a communione papatus.

Digitized by Google

to Christ's institution, which is, that the infant be baptized in water, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. 2. That this be done in a dissipation of the Church, such as we now see every where throughout the Palatinate: for in such a state of the Church God pardons many things, which in a well-ordered Church it would not be right and proper to admit of. Circumcision, no doubt, was administered with many faults and corruptions, whilst religion itself was so much corrupted among the people of Israel; and yet we never read that it was reiterated, when the people were called to the pure worship of God again. So, in like manner, in the last age, the baptism of the Papists was vitiated and defiled with many superstitions; but yet it was never repeated by the reformed Churches, when they separated themselves from the communion of the Papacy." Thus far we have seen the judgment of the several Churches of the Reformation beyond seas.

### SECT. V.—*The Practice of the Church of England.*

I come, in the last place, to consider the practice of the Church of England. Where we may observe some difference between the directions given in the liturgy, as it stood in the time of King Edward and Queen Elizabeth, and those of the liturgy in the time of King James, which received some alteration after the Conference held at Hampton-Court. In the old liturgy, the rubric of private baptism runs in these words:[m] "First let them present call upon God for his grace, and say the Lord's prayer, if the time will suffer: and then one of them shall name the child, and dip him in the water, or pour water upon him, saying these words, 'I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." This rubric was couched in such general terms, without restraining private baptism to a minister, that hence it is certain in fact, occasion was taken frequently, both by laymen and women, to baptize children privately, without a public minister: whence arose two questions among the learned men of those days: 1. Whether

[m] Hamon L'Estrange, Alliance of Divine Offices, chap. viii. p. 222.

Digitized by Google

such baptisms were legally performed, and according to the intent and rules of the Church? And, 2. If they were illegal and against rule, whether they were also wholly null and invalid, and, as such, to be repeated again? Upon the first point learned men were a little divided; some were of opinion that the words of the rubric did noways authorize lay-persons, men or women, to baptize in private; but by private baptism only meant baptism administered in a private house, not publicly in a church, and this to be given only by the minister, and not by any private person. This was the sense of Archbishop Whitgift, as is evident both from his Answer to the Admonition, and his defence of it against Cartwright. His words are these:[n] "The book of Common Prayer doth call it private baptism, in respect of the place, which is a private house, and not in respect of the minister. For even in necessity the curate may be sent for, or some other minister that may sooner be come by."—See also the Conference at Hampton-Court. Others think the Church, though she did not approve of this kind of baptism, yet intended to permit and tolerate it for a time, till men's prejudices and wrong notions, settled in them by long custom, might gently wear off without any prejudice to the reformation. So Archbishop Abbot gives his opinion of this rubric:[o] "As Moses," says he, "for a time suffered the Israelites, for the hardness of their hearts, to give a bill of divorce in lesser causes; so, for the weakness of men, and hardness of some, laymen were suffered to baptize. Which I take to have been the true reason, why any mention was made of private baptism, by those who first abolished super-

[n] Whitgift, Defence of the Answer to the Admonition, tract. ix. p. 504.

[o] Abbot, Prælect. ii. de Baptismo, p. 70, edit. Oxon. 1597. Ut Moses aliquando, præ duritia cordium, passus est divortii repudiive libellum in causis levioribus dare, sic, præ infirmitate hominum aut duritia aliquorum, laicos mysteriis imbuere passi sunt (majores). Quod pro certo existimo in causa fuisse, cur in regno olim nostro, qui, abolita superstitione, preces nostras et liturgiam in certam formam librumque redegerunt, privati baptismi mentionem subintulerunt; non quod baptismum datum per laicos, potissimum autem per feminas, legitimum esse arbitrati fuissent, sed ne primis evangelii revocandi auspiciis indoctam et insciam multitudinem a vera pietate deterrerent, illud ingerendo, quod imbibitæ per multos annos opinioni expresse adeo adversaretur. . . . Sed toleratio et permissio fas et justum esse, quod ad tempus toleratur, non concludit.



Digitized by Google

stition, and compiled the Common Prayer-Book in this kingdom: not that they thought baptism given by laymen was altogether legitimate and right; but they were not willing to deter the ignorant and unlearned people from the true religion at the first dawning of the Reformation, by pressing too severely upon them a thing which was so directly contrary to the opinion which they had for many years imbibed. But a toleration and permission does not conclude that to be right and just, which is only tolerated for a time." This difference in men's opinions continued to the time of the Hampton-Court Conference: for there the several disputants expressed their minds variously upon it. Archbishop Whitgift was still of the same mind,[p] "That the administration of baptism by women and lay-persons was not allowed in the practice of the Church, but inquired of by bishops in their visitations, and censured; neither do the words in the book infer any such meaning." But the king excepted to this, and urged the words of the book, that they could not but intend a permission and suffering of women and private persons to baptize. The bishop of Worcester, Babington, said, "That the words were doubtful, and might be pressed to that meaning; but yet it seemed by the contrary practice of our Church (censuring women in this case), that the compilers of the book did not so intend them, and yet propounded them ambiguously, because otherwise, perhaps, the book would not have then passed in parliament." Whereunto Bancroft, the bishop of London, replied, "That those learned and reverend men, who framed the Book of Common Prayer, intended not by ambiguous terms to deceive any, but did, indeed, by those words intend a permission of private persons to baptize in case of necessity, whereof their letters were witnesses;"— some parts whereof he then read, and withal declared that the same was agreeable to the practice of the Primitive Church.

Bilson, the bishop of Winchester, spake also very learnedly and earnestly in that point, affirming,[q] "That the denying of private persons, in cases of necessity, to baptize,

[p] Conference at Hampton-Court, p. 14. [q] Ibid. p. 18.

Digitized by Google

were to cross all antiquity, seeing that it had been the ancient and common practice of the Church, when ministers at such times could not be got; and that it was also a rule agreed upon by divines, that the minister is not of the essence of the sacrament." To which his majesty answered, "Though he be not of the essence of the sacrament, yet he is of the essence of the right and lawful ministry of the sacrament; taking for his ground the commission of Christ to his disciples (Matt. xxviii. 20), 'Go, preach and baptize.'"

Dr. Willet, who wrote his Controversies whilst the old rubric was in force, was also of Archbishop Whitgift's opinion,[r] "That neither laymen of what calling soever, nor midwives, or any other women, ought to be suffered in a well-reformed church to baptize infants; neither are they authorized so to do amongst us."

This difference there was then in men's opinions concerning the sense of the rubric of our Church, as it then stood: but yet they all agreed upon the second point, "That whether such baptisms were according to rule or against rule, permitted or not permitted, yet they were not absolutely null and void, or, as such, to be repeated by a lawful minister in order to obtain salvation." Archbishop Whitgift pleads as strongly as any man for the validity of such baptisms, though he did not believe them to be done according to any rule, or so much as permission, of the Church. In one place he argues thus against Cartwright, who disliked as well deacons as women baptizing:[s] "We read in the eighth of the Acts, that Philip, a deacon, did baptize; we read also that Moses's wife did circumcise: but where doth this Church of England allow any woman to baptize, or deacon to celebrate the Lord's Supper? And if it did, the dignity of the sacraments do not depend upon man, be he minister or not minister, be he good or evil. Let every one take heed that they do not usurp that authority where-

[r] Willet, Synopsis Papismi, p. 490. Non permittendum esse in bene constituta ecclesia laicis cujuscunque conditionis vel obstetricibus, ut infantes baptizent; nec auctoritatem illis dandam hoc faciendi inter nostrates.

[s] Whitgift, Defence of the Answer to the Admonition, tract. ix. p. 515.

Digitized by Google

unto they be not called." In another place, speaking again of Zippora's circumcision, he says, "Moses at this time was extremely sick, and therefore could not execute that office himself." And in the Geneva Bible there is this note: "That it was extraordinary: for Moses was sore sick, and God even then required it. Zippora, therefore, did circumcise in a point of extremity, and not wilfully, or of purpose: and that circumcision was a true circumcision, though it were not done ordinarily: even so baptism is true baptism, though it be sometimes ministered by such as are not ordinary ministers." A little after he pleads the universal practice of all Churches, ancient and modern: "Although," says he, "divers, both old and new, do not allow that laymen should be suffered to baptize; yet there is none of them (such only excepted as err in rebaptization) that think the being of the sacrament so to depend upon the minister, that it is no sacrament if it be not celebrated by a minister." Here he alleges Tertullian, Ambrose, Jerome, Austin, Zuinglius, and Calvin himself. And then concludes, that if his adversaries' doctrine were true, there had need be some general rebaptization throughout all Christendom, as well of men as of children: for certain it is that that sacrament hath been ministered to many by such as be in no degree of the ministry. He urges further the famous example of Athanasius, and the Jew that was baptized in sand instead of water by a layman. This latter was rebaptized, but not the former. "This argueth," says he,[w] "that the Church then made no doubt in respect of the persons that ministered this baptism, but only because there lacked water. . . . And, certainly, if the being of the sacrament depended upon man in any respect, we were but in a miserable case: for we should be always in doubt, whether we were rightly baptized or no. But it is most true, that the force and strength of the sacrament is not in man, be he minister or not minister, be he good or evil, but in God himself, in his Spirit, in his free and effectual operation. This I speak not to bring confusion into the Church (for, as I said before, let men

[t] Whitgift's Defence of the Answer to the Admonition, tract. ix. p. 517.
[u] Ibid. p. 518. [w] Ibid. p. 519.

Digitized by Google

take heed that they usurp not an office, whereunto they be not called,—for God will call them to an account for so doing) but to teach a truth, to take a yoke of doubtfulness from men's consciences, and to resist an error not much differing from Donatism and Anabaptism." He finally illustrates this matter from the example of preaching:[x] "He that speaketh the words of Scripture, and doth interpret them, preacheth, though he be not thereunto called: and it is the true word of God he preacheth, if he truly interpret; but he intrudeth himself into a vocation whereunto he is not called, and therefore offendeth God: but that doth derogate nothing from the word preached. The same reason is of the administration of the sacraments: for as the word of God is the word of God by whomsoever it is preached, minister or other, so is the sacrament of baptism true baptism by whomsoever it be celebrated: the usurper of the office hath to answer for his intrusion, but the sacrament is not thereby defiled." And a little after,[y] "I go not about to prove that women may baptize, only I withstand this error, that the substance and being of the sacraments dependeth upon the man in any respect. I say, that baptism ministered by women is true baptism, though it be not lawful for women to baptize; as the baptism also ministered by heretics is true baptism, though they be usurpers of the office. And I further say, that if the baptism administered by heretical ministers, which be no members of the Church, be notwithstanding good and effectual, I see no cause why it should not be so rather, if it be ministered by laymen which are members and parts of the Church." Mr. Hooker had occasion to answer Cartwright upon the same subject, and he does it almost as copiously as the archbishop; but I shall only transcribe one passage, wherewith he concludes his discourse upon it. "Last of all," says he,[z] "whereas general and full consent of the godly learned in all ages doth make for validity of baptism, yea, albeit administered in private and even by women; which kind of baptism, in case of necessity,

[x] Whitgift's Defence of the Answer to the Admonition, tract. ix. p. 520.

[y] Ibid. p. 521. [z] Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, Book v. n. lxii. Keble's edition, Oxford, 1836, vol. ii. p. 388.

Digitized by Google

divers reformed Churches do both allow and defend; some others which do not defend, tolerate; few, in comparison, and they without any just cause, do utterly disannul and annihilate; surely, howsoever through defects on either side, the sacrament may be without fruit, as well in some cases to him that receiveth, as to him which giveth it,—yet no disability of either part can so far make it frustrate and without effect, as to deprive it of the very nature of true baptism, having all things else which the ordinance of Christ requireth. Whereupon we may consequently infer that the administration of this sacrament by private persons, be it lawful or unlawful, appeareth not as yet to be merely void." Archbishop Abbot, in his theological lecture before the university of Oxford, largely maintains the same opinion, that such baptisms,[a] though irregularly given, are not to be repeated. His reasons are, 1. Because the person of the minister is not of the essence or being of the sacrament, but only of the well-being. The form of the sacrament is baptizing in water in the name of the Trinity. Therefore, it is most agreeable to the rules of piety, to have it done only by a minister; but yet it is done, though it be done by another. 2. He argues from the axiom of the law, which is, *multa fieri non debent, quæ tamen facta valent;* 'many things ought not to be done, which yet are valid when they are done:' as the marriage of children against the consent of their parents; which is a thing that ought not to be done, but yet it is valid when it is done. 3. He argues from the general and perpetual consent and practice of the Church. 4. From the sense and practice of the Church of England, which, for a time, tolerated such baptisms, and left this direction in the old rubric of private baptism, "Let them not doubt that the child, so baptized, is lawfully and sufficiently baptized, and ought not to be baptized again." 5. Lastly, from the inconveniences that would attend the contrary practice among the whole congregation of Christians. For if none but a priest, every way qualified without exception, might

[a] Abbot, Prælect. ii. de Bapt. p. 99. Ministrantis personam non de esse sacramenti, sed de bene esse judicarunt. . . . Pie igitur fit, si minister tangat solus; at fit etiam, si tangat alius.

Digitized by Google

in any case baptize, how great a part of faithful and pious Christians would want the seal of their Christianity? Or who could be certain, that he himself was baptized in every respect as he ought to be? For one that was never ordained, may take upon him the person of a priest. Or, perhaps, one may take holy orders, who never was baptized. Or if he was baptized and ordained, he may be consecrated by a bishop who was no lawful bishop, nor had any power to give imposition of hands to others. These, and suchlike doubts, both may and often do happen, as reason and experience testify. Whence he concludes, upon the whole matter, "That baptism is valid, though given by a layman or woman, having the perpetual consent of the Church, and not being repugnant to the truth of the Divine oracles." This writer read his lectures in Oxford in the year 1597. And about five or six years after, there was a treatise published in the name of the whole university of Oxford, wherein the same doctrine is defended. This was the answer to the Millenary petition. The title is, "The Answer of the University of Oxford to a Petition of some Ministers of the Church of England, desiring Reformation of certain Ceremonies. Oxon. 1603, 4to." At Cambridge the same assertion was maintained by Whitaker,[b] as Dr. Forbes[c] alleges him, who dislikes his opinion. And if Archbishop Abbot was a competent judge of the books then written, there were few or none of the Church of England in those days that determined otherwise. Many were inclined to censure lay-baptism as irregular and unlawful; but they all agreed in this, that it was valid, and not to be repeated as a mere nullity, when once it was done. "The present times," says he,[d] "as far as I can judge, have not departed from the determination of their forefathers, but keep it as a

[b] Whitaker de Baptismo, Quæst. iii. c. i.

[c] Forbes, Instruct. Hist. Theol. lib. x. c. xiv. n. xii. Hæc omnia si accuratius pensitasset Whitakerus noster, non adeo timuisset irritum statuere eum baptismum, quem ministrassent homines vocatione destituti, in controversia de Baptismo, Quæst. iii. c. i.

[d] Abbot, Prælect. ii. de Bapt. Nostra etiam tempora, quantum ego novi, ab eorum determinatione non discesserunt, sed tamquam depositum apud nos et traditum custodiunt.

Digitized by Google

depositum handed down from them." Cartwright, indeed, and his followers, who affected the French discipline more than they did the English, went generally the other way, and declared openly not only against the lawfulness, but the validity, of lay-baptisms in any case whatever. And, therefore, they continually declaimed against the old rubric of private baptism, and importunately called for an alteration. This, among other things, brought on the Conference at Hampton-Court, the result of which was, that the rubric should be made a little more plain, by inserting the word 'lawful minister,' instead of the general term, 'one of them that be present,' as it was ambiguously worded before. This determined the question about the lawfulness of lay-baptism so far, as that now it could not well be thought to be permitted or enjoined by the Church. But as to the other question, about the validity of lay-baptisms when done, the divines of the Church determined still the same way that they had done before. For though some alteration was made in the rubric, and the word 'lawful minister' inserted, yet they thought still no intimation was given, that private baptisms, by any other beside a lawful minister, should be esteemed absolutely null and invalid; nor any provision made in that case that they should be repeated. Isaac Casaubon, who wrote by the order of King James, and in defence of him against Cardinal Perron, some years after the Conference at Hampton-Court, speaks thus in the name of the Church of England:[e] "What was heretofore said by Tertullian concerning the Primitive Church, that baptism was administered by bishops, priests, and deacons; and that laymen also, in cases of extreme necessity, might do it; the very same is now observed in the Church of England, so far as concerns bishops, presbyters, and deacons, without tying

[e] Casaubon, Resp. ad Epist. Perron. p. 33, Lond. 1612. Quod igitur de nascente olim ecclesia dixit Tertullianus, Baptizare episcopum, presbyterum, diaconum: postremo etiam laicis jus esse, in extremæ videlicet necessitatis casu; hoc ipsum in ecclesia Anglicana, quod ad episcopos presbyteros et diaconos hodieque servatur, sine ulla vel temporis rigida et penitus inviolabili observatione: laicorum vero baptismum, aut feminarum, ut fieri legibus suis vetat, sic factum ex legitima formula quodammodo non improbat, baptismum esse pronuntians, etsi non legitime administratum.

Digitized by Google

them strictly to any rigid observation of time or place: and for the baptism of lay-persons, men or women, though she forbid it to be done by her laws; yet, when it is done in due form, she does not altogether disallow or reject it, pronouncing it to be baptism, though not lawfully administered."

King James asserted the same in the Hampton-Court Conference: for though he so expounded the necessity of baptism, as that it was only necessary to be had, where it might be lawfully had, that is, ministered by lawful ministers, by whom alone, and by no private person, he thought it might, in any case, be administered; yet he said he utterly disliked all rebaptization, although either women or laics had baptized.

And, indeed, he shewed his dislike upon some particular occasions: for when one Mr. Crompton had written a book, called St. Austin's Religion, wherein he had asserted,[g] "That for a layman, and much more for a woman, to baptize, in case of necessity, was, in St. Austin's opinion, a pardonable sin; though pardonable, yet a sin, and the usurping of another's office;" Dr. Featly tells us,[h] King James, in part, disliked that which Mr. Crompton had delivered. And when he defended himself, by saying, "That in the Conference at Hampton-Court, women's baptizing was utterly condemned; and whereas, before, women were allowed to baptize in case of necessity, the new rubric restrained baptism to the lawful minister;" the king excepted to this answer, and told him, "That in all the several impressions of the Book of Common Prayer, there was nothing said of a woman's baptizing, neither to warrant it to be done, nor to condemn it when it was done. Neither doth St. Austin simply condemn a layman or woman baptizing in case of necessity as a sin, but saith, either it is no fault, or a pardonable one." And this, he said, was the sum of the resolution at Hampton-Court in this point, howsoever some had mistaken it. By which it plainly appears what was the judgment of King James concerning the sense and practice of the English Church, that though she had given

[f] Conference at Hampton-Court, p. 18.

[g] Crompton's Relig. of St. Austin, p. 95. [h] Featly's Cygnea Cantio, q. 21.

Digitized by Google

no authority to lay-persons to baptize, yet neither did she absolutely condemn it when it was done, or by any public act order it to be repeated. This was the king's judgment, delivered upon this occasion a few weeks before his death.

In the reign of King Charles II., one Ambrose Fisher wrote a Defence of the Liturgy of the Church of England (Lond. 1630), wherein he maintains the same assertion, "That though laymen were prohibited to baptize, yet, when it was done, their baptism was valid, and not to be repeated."

Dr. Forbes, indeed, the learned Scotch professor, set himself to oppose this, in a particular dissertation among his Historical Theological Instructions,[1] where the reader may find the whole strength of the contrary side. But he goes upon such principles as cannot possibly be maintained by any English divine, nor were ever maintained by any ancient writer: for he argues as much against the lawfulness and validity of baptism administered by deacons as by laymen; when yet nothing can be plainer than the power and authority which the Church gives them in the office and form of their ordination: for there they are told, "That it appertaineth to the office of a deacon in the Church, in the absence of the priest, to baptize infants." And accordingly, when the bishop says, "Take thou authority to execute the office of a deacon in the Church of God committed unto thee," it must be understood that, among other things, the power and authority of baptizing is conferred upon them. But now, if the baptism of deacons be invalid, as Dr. Forbes asserts, if none but a priest can administer it, nor grant absolution and pardon of sins, that belongs to that sacrament; then the Church of England has been hitherto mistaken in conferring orders upon deacons, and investing them with authority to baptize. But if the Church has power to authorize deacons to baptize, then their baptism is not only valid, but authorized and authentic too. And that learned person, and all others who invalidate the baptism of deacons upon this principle, that they want sacerdotal

[1] Forbes. Instruct. Hist. lib. x. c. xiv.

Digitized by Google

powers, —are under a great mistake to oppose a practice so firmly established in the constitution of the Church of England. However it be, it is certain, there is a manifest opposition betwixt him and the Church upon this head; and therefore he cannot be supposed to speak the sense of our Church, when he invalidates the baptism of deacons. Nor does he produce any rule of the Church to invalidate the baptism of laymen, but proceeds upon other grounds, which have been considered in the foregoing parts of this discourse.

Bishop Taylor also argues for the invalidity of laymen's baptism in any case whatsoever:[k] but he does not pretend the Church has given any order to rebaptize such as are unlawfully baptized by laymen. Nor do I know any author, till of late, that has pleaded the authority of the Church for rebaptization in such cases; but the sense which was given by Casaubon and King James, has generally passed for the sense of the Church of England. And, indeed, if the Church had intended more, it had been easy when she altered her rubric, forbidding any but a lawful minister to baptize, to have inserted a further order and decree, to rebaptize all such as were otherwise baptized; as the French Church did, both in her canons and Book of Discipline, because she thought all baptisms that were not given by a lawful minister, to be absolutely null and void. Which the Church of England having never yet done, it may be presumed it was not her sense to make her discipline so rigorous as that of the French Church, in requiring rebaptization. At least Casaubon and King James, who were very capable of knowing her sense, so understood it; and we do not find many that have been inclined to contradict them. So that, upon the whole, it must be concluded, for any thing that yet appears to the contrary, that what Casaubon said in the name of King James, is the present sense of the Church of England: she forbids laymen or women, by her laws, to baptize; but if it be done in due form, though she does not approve of it, yet she does not wholly disannul it, or order it to be repeated, as absolutely null and void. And whether

[k] Taylor, Ductor Dubitant. book iii. chap. iv. rule xv.

Digitized by Google

any alteration is proper to be made in this affair, is none of my province to determine: I have performed, as far as I could, the part of a faithful historian, to correct the errors of some, and inform the judgment of others, and leave the rest to be determined in a lawful assembly.

Digitized by Google

AN

# APPENDIX,

CONTAINING

SOME REMARKS ON THE HISTORICAL PART OF MR. LAWRENCE'S WRITINGS, TOUCHING THE INVALIDITY OF LAY-BAPTISM; HIS PRELIMINARY DISCOURSE OF THE VARIOUS OPINIONS OF THE FATHERS CONCERNING REBAPTIZATION AND INVALID BAPTISMS; AND HIS DISCOURSE OF SACERDOTAL POWERS.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

AN

# APPENDIX,

*&c. &c.*

---

When I had almost finished the foregoing discourse, I had occasion to look into these writings, as containing some historical matters relating to the present subject. I was the more tempted to inspect them, because the author pretends to write with great accuracy, even to a mathematical exactness. I will not concern myself, at present, with his reasonings, but only his history, in which he will pardon me if I friendly shew him and the world some few of his mistakes, which are neither according to the rules of history, nor the exactness of a mathematical method and way of writing. In his discourse of Sacerdotal Powers (chap. v. p. 120), he has these words: "After the Council of Nice, the major proposition, 'That those whom a laic baptizeth, are to be rebaptized,' was looked upon to be so true, that it was the undoubted principle whereby the orthodox confuted the Luciferians: for thus they argued: 'Those whom a laic baptizeth, are to be rebaptized; but those whom an Arian priest baptizeth, are not to be rebaptized: therefore an Arian priest is not a laic.' This argument so confounded Hilary, the deacon, that he was forced to deny the major, which his master, Lucifer, had granted before, viz. 'That those whom a laic baptizeth, are to be rebaptized;' and which St. Jerome affirms by the authority of the Nicene Council. (Hieron. Dial. adver. Lucif.) St. Chrysostom, archbishop of Constantinople (an. 398), is express for the invalidity of

Digitized by Google

lay-baptism; and that in cases of necessity, it can be no more administered by a laic than the eucharist. 'But all these things,' says he,[a] 'can be administered by no other man living, but by those sacred hands alone,—the hands, I say, of the priest.' These are instances for which I am beholden to the learned and Reverend Mr. William Reeves's notes on the second volume of the Apol. of Justin Martyr, pp. 263, 264." Thus far our author.

In which paragraph there are abundance of mistakes, of several kinds. The first, and least, is his misquoting Mr. Reeves's notes on Justin Martyr, instead of Vincentius Lirinensis. 2. He makes Mr. Reeves say, what he really does not, that Hilary, the deacon, was forced to deny the major (proposition in the argument), which his master, Lucifer, had granted before, viz. that those whom a laic baptizeth, are to be rebaptized; and that St. Jerome affirms this by the authority of the Nicene Council: whereas Mr. Reeves says expressly, "That Hilary, the deacon, did not deny the major proposition, but the assumption, which his master, Lucifer, had granted; which was, that those whom an Arian priest baptizeth, are not to be rebaptized;" and that this was an assumption, which St. Jerome confirmed by the authority of the Nicene Council. Mr. Lawrence did not here distinguish between a major and a minor proposition, but unluckily changes Mr. Reeves's terms, and puts major instead of assumption, which stands for a minor proposition only in all logics whatsoever. We are not like to find, I am afraid, great exactness in history, when it is to be fetched from ancient Greek and Latin authors, by a person who could make so unhappy a mistake only in transcribing an English author. Let us next examine, thirdly, what errors he commits in point of ancient history, by virtue of this mistake. He makes Lucifer hereby a witness for the invalidity of laymen's baptism, by making him say, "That those whom a laic baptizeth, are to be rebaptized:" which proposition, when he produces Lucifer's plain testimony for

[a] Chrysostom. lib. iii. de Sacerd. c. v. Πάντα δὲ ταῦτα δι' ἱερέως μὲν οἰδενὸς, μόνον δὲ διὰ τῶν ἁγίων ἐκείνων ἐπιτελεῖται χειρῶν· τῶν τοῦ ἱερέως λέγω.

Digitized by Google

it, shall have my assent, and not before. 4. He makes St. Jerome affirm universally the same thing: and yet it is as plain as words can make it, that St. Jerome allowed laymen to give baptism in cases of necessity; as I have proved before from that very Dialogue against the Luciferians, upon which he grounds the contrary assertion. 5. He makes St. Jerome assert that pretended proposition upon the authority of the Nicene Council: and yet neither is there any such canon in the Nicene Council; nor did ever St. Jerome assert there was, but only a canon about allowing some heretical bishops and priests to enjoy the honour of their places, and not be degraded to laymen, upon their return to the unity of the Catholic Church. 6. He says, St. Chrysostom is express for the invalidity of lay-baptism; and that in cases of necessity it can be no more administered by a laic, than the eucharist. But St. Chrysostom neither expressly mentions the case of necessity, nor lay-baptism, nor the invalidity of it; but only says, "Baptism is not administered by any but the hands of a priest:" which if it were to be taken in the strictest sense, to exclude all others besides priests, in cases of extreme necessity, it would exclude deacons as well as laymen; unless this author will say that deacons are priests, or shew that St. Chrysostom thought them to be so, which I am sure he did not, and yet he allowed them to baptize in cases of necessity, when a priest could not be had; as I have fully proved before, against Dr. Forbes, in answer to this very objection. But if such men as Dr. Forbes and Mr. Reeves, who was this author's guide, were under some mistake in this matter, I do not wonder a less skilful writer should readily follow them: but for his other mistakes, they are so gross and palpable, that I think he is bound in justice, both to Mr. Reeves and the world, ingenuously to acknowledge his misrepresentation, and correct his errors, as he has modestly promised to do, when any one modestly better informs him.

The next thing I shall take notice of, is his treatment of St. Basil, in whose mouth he puts an argument, and makes him contradict himself upon it. He says (p. 119), St. Basil thus argues: "Those whom a laic baptizeth, are to be



Digitized by Google

rebaptized: but those whom a heretic or schismatic baptizeth, a laic baptizeth: therefore such are to be rebaptized." This argument he made use of to prove, that heretical and schismatical baptisms were null and void; and he reckoned them so, because he thought them of the same nature as lay-baptisms in those days. His major proposition, that those whom a laic baptizeth, are to be rebaptized, was not denied: he had no opposers to defend such baptisms. All the opposition he met with was, that they denied his minor, that those whom a heretic or schismatic baptizeth, a laic baptizeth. And, therefore, though they did not deny but lay-baptism was null and void, yet they affirmed heretical and schismatical baptisms to be good, because they were not lay-baptisms; and to this St. Basil consented.[b]

But did St. Basil consent, that heretics and schismatics were laymen and not laymen at the same time? Did he consent that their baptism was null and void, and yet good too notwithstanding? Either St. Basil was very weak, so to contradict himself; or else our author was very weak to father such a contradiction upon him. But, perhaps, he had it from Mr. Reeves, to whom he professes himself beholden for all these instances. No, indeed, it is an improvement upon Mr. Reeves, I think; but, if otherwise, Mr. Reeves must answer for himself. In the meantime, I will answer our author. St. Basil does not bring that as his own argument, but only relates it as the argument of St. Cyprian and Firmilian: but our author does not distinguish between a man's acting the part of a historian, and that of a logician: he might as well say, all the arguments I have related in this book, are my own, because I have related so many men's arguments and opinions upon the present subject. If he had looked into St. Basil himself, he might have seen this. But was not St. Basil of opinion that lay-baptisms and heretical baptisms were null and void? Yes. But he did not then say they were good and valid too: but only he was so modest, as not to condemn or break communion with those Churches, who differed both in opinion and practice from him. And, therefore, because

[b] Basil. Canon. Epist. ad Amphiloch. c. i.

Digitized by Google

there were other Churches in Asia, who allowed of the baptism of schismatics as valid, he advises those who were members of those Churches, to comply with the custom and practice of their respective Churches: ἔστω δεκτὸν, 'Let it be received.' But he does not say the same of heretics; but thinks every Church ought to repeat their baptism. For he makes a great distinction between the baptism of heretics and schismatics; and so our author should have distinguished, if he would rightly have represented St. Basil's opinion. For though, in his own private judgment, he was for rebaptizing both of them, yet he makes some allowance for schismatics, who kept the faith, which he does not for heretics who destroyed it: and, therefore, admits of a compliance in other Churches, in the one case, which he does by no means allow in the other. I have produced the passage at large in the first chapter, sect. xx.: to which the reader may have recourse.

I come next to his preliminary discourse of the various opinions of the Fathers concerning rebaptization and invalid baptisms. Here I observe, in general, that he delivers ancient history often very magisterially, without referring his reader to any particular places in his authors, whereby to judge of the truth of his assertions. Thus he says (p. 2), that the Stephanians, among other arguments which they mustered up for the validity of heretical baptisms, used this for one: "That all catechumens, who died unbaptized, were not therefore damned; much less those who had received baptism, though from heretics or schismatics." I do not dispute his assertion about the catechumens, but desire him only to inform the world, in what writing of the Stephanians, as he calls them, he finds this maintained, That they who had received baptism from heretics or schismatics, were in a state of salvation. And when he alleges his author, we shall be better able to judge of the truth of the assertion.

Page 10, he tells us, Athanasius, in the fourth century, rejected the baptism of heretics. By which he would insinuate, that Athanasius was of Cyprian's opinion, and rejected the baptism of all heretics in general. But he refers his reader to no place; and he is left to look it in two or

Digitized by Google

three large volumes of Athanasius's works: yet I suppose he means his third oration against the Arians (tom. i. p. 413),[c] where he disputes against the Arians' baptism, and rejects it as invalid, because they rejected the fundamental doctrine of the Trinity, though they kept to the form of baptizing used in the Church. But this is not simply to reject the baptism of heretics; for he allowed the baptism of all others, as I have shewed in the foregoing discourse, chap. i. sect. xx.

In the same page he brings the testimony of Pacianus, without referring the reader to any place where to find it, and it is scarce worth his while to inquire after it: for it is alleged to no manner of purpose: for what if Pacianus says,[d] "That baptism purifies from sins, and unction brings down the Holy Spirit; and both the one and the other are applied by the hand and the mouth of the bishop;" what does this testimony testify concerning rebaptization or invalid baptism? Either it signifies nothing at all; or else it signifies more than our author would have it signify, that no baptism is valid, no more than confirmation, that is not applied by the hand and mouth of a bishop: for this would destroy all sacerdotal powers, and make the baptism of priests invalid, as well as that of deacons and laymen.

Page 11. In the next place, he produces Optatus; but still keeps his reader in the dark, and leaves him to read over seven books against Parmenian, to find a single passage in that author, who seems to think, he says, "That we ought to rebaptize those who were baptized by heretics; but does not make the same determination concerning those who were baptized by schismatics." But if our author had dealt kindly by his reader, he should have referred him to the fifth book of Optatus (p. 85), where he might have found, without any trouble, that it was not the baptism of all heretics that he rejected, but only such as did not baptize into the faith of the holy Trinity: for Optatus was of the same opinion with Athanasius, and says, "If men were baptized in the faith of the Trinity, their baptism was not

[c] Page 510, Orat. ii. edit. Paris. 1698.

[d] Sermon. de Bapt. in Bibl. Patr. tom. iv. p. 318, h. edit. Lugd. 1677. See Origin. Eccles. vol. iv. p. 3; book xii. chap. i. sect. i. note (ε).

Digitized by Google

repeated when they came over to the Catholic Church." I have produced the passage at large above, and need not here repeat it.

His reflections on the Council of Eliberis, which follow immediately after, are just enough: that it was but a particular council; and that it authorized only some laymen to baptize, but not all; and those not anti-episcopal, but in subjection to their bishops.

But his next reflections on the first Council of Arles, p. 12, are not so just and accurate. For he diminishes the authority of this Council, by following the faulty subscriptions, which make but thirty-three bishops to have been present at it. Whereas it was a plenary council of the whole Western Church, as St. Austin calls it, consisting of two hundred bishops, as Baronius, Schelstrate, Pagi, and most other learned critics, except Valesius, readily allow. He says further, p. 13, "That the ancient heretics and schismatics, whose baptisms that Council allowed, had com monly received ordination from the hands of some Catholic bishop or other;" whence he concludes, that those baptisms were not anti-episcopal: which are both mistaken assertions. For many of the heresies and schisms of those times had a long succession of false bishops of their own, who were not ordained by Catholic bishops, as the Novatians, Quartadecimans, and several others, who certainly did not act by any authority of the Catholic Church, whilst they were out of the holy Catholic Church, and in manifest opposition to it. And though they had all been ordained by Catholic bishops, yet they were no longer authorized to minister by the Catholic Church, than they continued in the Church: but as soon as they fell into heresies and schisms, they were anti-episcopal, properly speaking, till they returned to the centre of unity in the Church again. If this author thinks otherwise, let him speak his mind plainly and roundly upon it. In the meantime, I will venture to assert, that anti-episcopal baptisms were, in some sense, the subject of that Council, forasmuch as heretical and schismatical baptisms were the subject of it.

Page 13, he says, "After the Council of Nice, it was a

Digitized by Google

prevailing principle, that those whom a laic baptized, were to be rebaptized; and that even Lucifer himself granted this proposition to be true." But I have already accounted with this author for his many and great mistakes about this matter, and therefore shall not here repeat them.

Page 16, he alleges the eighth canon of the second Council of Carthage, in these words:[e] "If a priest, excommunicated by his own bishop, undertake to offer up the sacrifices in private, and to set up altar against altar, thereby making a schism, he ought to be anathematized; because there is but one Church, one faith, and one baptism." His remark upon this canon is, "That this one baptism cannot be supposed to be out of this one Church, and therefore is only in it." But this remark is made with great faintness and ambiguity. Why did he not speak plainly, and say, All such baptisms are utterly void, null, and invalid; and, as such, to be repeated again? But, perhaps, he was sensible this was too plain against the mind of the Council, which did not intend to declare such baptisms absolutely invalid and void; but only unlawfully given by persons who had no authority to give them in such a capacity, whilst they continued in such a schismatical opposition to their bishop, though they had otherwise received a lawful ordination from him. Which may convince our author, if he will be convinced, that all unauthorized and unlawful baptisms are not presently invalid: for a priest's baptism, if it be given in such circumstances as the Council supposes, is unauthorized and unlawful, as well as that of a layman, and yet not to be repeated, when the party so baptized returns to the Church again. And it may convince him, further, that these terms — unauthorized baptism, invalid baptism, and lay-baptism — are terms of different import, though they are usually confounded together, and made equivalent by our author; which is the πρῶτον ψεῦδος, or 'the reigning error,' that runs through his whole book. For,

Page 24, he repeats this again, "That the Church has

[e] Ultima verba, 'quia una tantum est ecclesia, una fides, unum baptisma,' non invenio in isthoc canone, apud Labbeum, tom. ii. Conc. p. 1161: et ipse etiam canon paulo aliter habet. — Grischow.

Digitized by Google

not, in any general council, made any determination about unauthorized and anti-episcopal baptisms:" as if either the baptisms of heretics, or schismatics, or excommunicated priests, were not unauthorized, or the Councils of Nice, or Arles, or Carthage, last mentioned, had made no decree about them.

Page 26, he says, his province is only confined to lay, *i. e.* unauthorized baptism, such as is performed by persons who never were authorized for that purpose. And the adversary can bring forth, in their behalf, not one council, either general or provincial, till the corrupt ones of the Church of Rome. Here he again confounds lay-baptisms and unauthorized baptisms together; as if all lay-baptisms were simply unauthorized, when they sometimes had the authority of bishops and canons to authorize them in certain cases. Or, as if there could be no unauthorized baptisms but mere lay-baptism; when yet it is so plain, that the baptisms of excommunicated priests are unauthorized, as well as those of mere laymen. And how can it be said, with truth, that no council can be produced for the validity of lay-baptism, or unauthorized baptism, when he himself owns, that the Council of Eliberis authorized the one, and so many councils confirmed the validity of the other?

Page 28, he alleges Tertullian in these words: "Baptism is reserved to the bishop: heretics are not able to give it, because they have it not; and therefore it is that we have a rule to rebaptize them." These few words are tacked together from two or three different places of Tertullian; and therefore, he would have done well to have pointed out the distinct books and chapters to his readers: which I have done to his hand in the foregoing discourse: the places are, *Tertul. de Bapt.* c. 15[f] and 17; and *De Pudicitia*, c. 19. Where he talks of a rule, indeed, to baptize heretics again; but that rule was not what our author says it was, the law and practice of the Church, but the *præceptum Domini in Evangelio*, 'the law of Christ and the apostles,' as Tertullian himself words it: which is the rule upon which he founded

[f] Paris. 1664, p. 230.

Digitized by Google

rebaptization of heretics, however our author came to mistake it. In the book *De Pudicitia*,[s] I own he speaks of the practice of rebaptizing heretics as heathens; but the rule by which he justifies this practice, is not the rule of the Church, but the rule of Christ. Yet our author here could easily discern, when it was for his turn, that Tertullian talked of a rule; and that that rule must needs be the law and rule of the Church, distinct from the law of Christ. But when Tertullian speaks of laymen having a license to baptize in cases of necessity, then, in our author's opinion, he vents strange, odd notions—his own private opinions, and not the Church's custom and allowance: though any unprejudiced person that will compare the places together, will find, that he makes the one the practice of the Church as well as the other, and founds them both equally upon the law of Christ, or the rule of the Gospel, which our author mistook for a canon of the Church.

Page 29, he says, "The Council of Eliberis, in the fourth century, made a rule for the allowance of lay-baptism:" and yet a little before we heard him say (page 26), that lay-baptism was the same as unauthorized baptism; and that there was not so much as a provincial council to be produced in its behalf, till the corrupt ones of Rome.

In the same page, he insists again upon the testimonies of St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, and the Catholics disputing with the Luciferians in the same century, as more than a balance against Tertullian's private opinion. But why did he not think the Council of Eliberis more than a balance against them? who if they were indeed against the opinion of Tertullian, a private person, they were also as much against the public opinion of the Council of Eliberis. But, in truth, the greater part of these pretended testimonies are neither against Tertullian nor the Council of Eliberis; as I have particularly noted of St. Chrysostom and St. Jerome, more than once in the foregoing dissertation. But because our

[s] Cui enim dubium est hæreticum institutione deceptum, cognito postmodum casu, et pœnitentia expiato, et veniam consequi et in ecclesiam redigi? Unde et apud nos ut ethnico par, immo et super ethnicum hæreticus etiam per baptisma veritatis utroque homine purgatus admittitur. (Paris. 1664, p. 581, A. 14.)

Digitized by Google

author talks so frequently and so much of the Catholics (in the plural) disputing with the Luciferians in the fourth century, I desire him to acquaint us what authors he has read against the Luciferians, besides St. Jerome; and I will be one of those that will give him my thanks for his information.

But his main testimony is still behind; and yet it is so little to the purpose, that I had once almost a mind to have overlooked it. He tells us (page 29), that Ignatius, the glorious martyr, who lived in the days of the apostles, in his epistles to the Smyrneans, says,[h] "Let that sacrament be judged effectual and firm which is dispensed by the bishop, or him to whom the bishop has committed it. It is not lawful, without the bishop, either to baptize or celebrate the offices; but what he approves of, according to the good pleasure of God, that is firm and safe, and so we do every thing securely." Our author thinks this exactly agreeable to the doctrine of St. Cyprian; and so he would deduce the rebaptization of heretics and schismatics from the apostles. But does Ignatius any where say that heretical and schismatical baptisms were simply invalid and to be repeated? He says, indeed, it is unlawful, and not safe to baptize, in opposition to the bishop's authority and order. And so I believe any man will say, that has a due respect for the authority of the episcopal function. But does it hence follow that all baptisms are absolutely invalid and void, that a schismatical presbyter gives in opposition to his bishop? It is unsafe, doubtless, either for minister or people, the baptizer or the baptized, to be concerned in such baptisms: They cannot, with a safe conscience, and without sin, if schism be a sin, be either agent or patient in such administrations; because they are acting in contempt and defiance

[h] Ἐκείνη βεβαία εὐχαριστία ἡγείσθω, ἡ ὑπὸ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον οὖσα, ἢ ᾧ ἂν αὐτὸς ἐπιτρέψῃ. . . . οὐκ ἐξόν ἐστι χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου οὔτε βαπτίζειν, [οὔτε προσφέρειν, οὔτε θυσίαν προσκομίζειν, οὔτε δοχὴν ἐπιτελεῖν· ἀλλ' ὅ ἂν ἐκείνῳ δοκῇ, κατ' εὐάρεστον θεῷ ἵνα ἀσφαλὲς ᾖ καὶ βέβαιον πᾶν ὅ ἂν πράσσητε.] ——The latter part of the preceding passage is given thus by Coteler, vol. ii. p. 37:—Οὔτε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν· ἀλλ' ὅ ἂν ἐκεῖνος δοκίμασῃ, τοῦτο καὶ τῷ Θεῷ εὐάρεστον· ἵνα ἀσφαλὲς ᾖ καὶ βέβαιον πᾶν ὃ πράσσεται.

Digitized by Google

of that lawful authority which God has appointed in his Church. But the way to correct these errors is not to disannul the sacrament by repeating it again, but to repent of the unlawful manner of giving or receiving it, in opposition to lawful authority and the established rules of the Church. But our author, as I observed, always confounds unauthorized baptism and invalid baptism together; and if an act be sinful, irregular, or illegal in the administrator, he presently concludes it must be null and void in the receiver. Which is his great mistake in his whole book, and particularly in interpreting this passage of Ignatius.

I shall but make one remark more upon our author's Preliminary Discourse, which is, in relation to his opinion of the invalidity of heretical and schismatical baptisms, which he thus expresses (pp. 27, 28): "To return once more to the dispute in St. Cyprian's time, and the decrees then and since made about it, I cannot dissemble my thoughts, that the arguments and determinations against his doctrine and practice, have nothing of that reason and solidity which an inquisitive person might justly expect in them: and that, on the contrary, St. Cyprian and his colleagues defend their assertion, that the baptisms of heretics and schismatics are invalid, with so much judgment and cogency of argument, founded upon the topic of such heretics and schismatics being destitute of holy orders while they were out of the Church of Christ, that I wonder how it could possibly have come to pass, that their doctrine should be afterwards exploded; especially when I consider, that what they taught and practised herein, was confirmed by numerous councils in those earlier days, wherein truth was more prevalent than afterwards; and Tertullian long before affirmed the same thing." Nay, he says, Ignatius maintained the very same doctrine with Cyprian; and he thinks nothing could have given credit and reputation to the contrary opinion, but the monstrous increase of heresy and schism afterwards, which, together with many other causes concurring, brought into the Church of Rome, and the rest of the Western Churches, whom she had subjected to her vassalage, abundance of damnable doctrines and practices,

Digitized by Google

insomuch that at last there was but little of solid and substantial religion to be found in the Churches of her communion.

Now let us put these things together, and view them narrowly, and see what will be the consequence. The baptisms of heretics and schismatics are invalid: the baptisms of the Church of Rome are the baptisms of heretics and schismatics; or, in his words, the baptisms of a Church that is overrun with abundance of damnable doctrines and practices, and has but little of solid or substantial religion to be found in her communion: therefore the baptisms of the Church of Rome are invalid. Now if the baptisms of the Church of Rome be invalid upon this principle, that the baptisms of heretics and schismatics are invalid; what then becomes of the validity of the baptisms of the Church of England, and all the other Churches of the Reformation? Had they not all their baptism from that heretical Church of Rome, which, upon our author's principles, could not give valid baptism, much less the power of baptizing to others? Is not this as plain as any demonstration in Euclid, or any one syllable of an argument in our author's book, that if the baptism of heretics and schismatics be invalid, and the Church of Rome be a heretical or schismatical Church, and the Church of England have her baptisms originally from that Church, and no other; that then the consequence must be, that all the baptisms of the Church of England are invalid, and that there is no true baptism administered by her priests any more than by others: for they are all but pretended priests, as having received their baptism and ordination originally from heretics and schismatics, who had no power to minister any other sacraments or orders but such as are invalid. I believe our author did not see the consequence of this argument, which unbaptizes all the Church of England at once, and himself among the rest, though he has been twice baptized or washed already. I know, indeed, he declares (p. 31), that it is not his design to meddle with the Cyprianic dispute in his discourse; his business is not to inquire, whether those who were once duly authorized, and afterwards fall into heresy or schism,

Digitized by Google

and thereby separate themselves, or are excluded from the Church,—can administer valid sacraments and ordinations during this their separation: no, he will not so much as touch upon this at all, because he does not think his case affected by it. But he has already touched upon it, and freely declared his opinion about it: and I have shewed him, what he did not think, that his case is wonderfully affected by it; and not only his case, but the case of all the Church of England, and all the Churches of the Reformation: which are all unbaptized; and there is neither a priest nor a Christian among them, if the principle he advances stand good, that the baptism of heretics and schismatics is utterly invalid: and he must seek for a priest of another kind to baptize him a third time with valid baptism, which he cannot have in the Church of England, nor the Church of Rome, nor the Churches of the Reformation, who all derive their invalid baptism from one and the same original. He must travel then as far as Constantinople for a priest of the Greek Church to do it: and when he comes there, he will, perhaps, find the same difficulties in that Church, as his principle makes in the rest of the European Churches nearer at hand. For in that Church there may be some question, whether there be not some heretical or schismatical doctrines maintained. She has some of the Romish errors; and, to use an expression of his (p. 30), "Too, too much of her leaven still remaining in her:" "one of her very great and peculiar corruptions," as our author styles it, "in the matter of lay-baptism and midwives' baptism," is still espoused by that whole; Church as I have proved unanswerably against my learned friend in the second chapter of the foregoing dissertation. To what Church, then, this gentleman will apply himself for valid baptism, I am at a loss to consider; and more at a loss to think by whom all the rest of Christendom are to be rebaptized. But, perhaps, he will call this a tragical representation; as indeed it is, but it is a true one: he will complain, it may be, that I drive his principle further than he intended, and charge it with consequences which he never thought of. I would charitably hope so indeed; but then, I must say

Digitized by Google

further, it is proper to shew him the dangerous consequences of his opinion, in order to convince him of the unreasonableness and absurdity of it. But, perhaps, he will say, he neither believes heretical and schismatical baptism to be invalid, nor the Church of Rome to be that heretical and schismatical Church, which I have represented from his character and picture of her. The reader will best judge of these things from his own words before recited; but if he denies these to be his opinions, I, for my part, will believe him; only beseeching him to express his mind a little more intelligibly upon such points for the future. And then I would ask him one question more: If the baptism of heretics and schismatics be valid, upon what foot it is so? Is it because they have an equal authority and commission to baptize, as well as Catholic priests? If so, whence is their authority and commission derived? Is it from the Catholic bishops of the Church? But sure they never intend to authorize heretics and schismatics to baptize, or perform any other ecclesiastical offices, which belong to the function of the Catholic clergy. Or if they ordain men to these offices, who, as soon as they are ordained, turn heretics and schismatics, and bid defiance to the Church, and set up separate meetings and conventicles to perform those offices, in direct opposition to the Church, and all her orders; can it enter into any man's head to think, that they do all these by the authority of the bishops of the Church, who first gave them ordination, when they are done so manifestly in contempt of all authority, and perhaps with a professed design to affront authority, and act independently of themselves, without any regard to the just rules of Catholic communion? No, certainly: they forfeit all legal authority to perform such offices, at least, after the Church pronounces a formal sentence and censure upon them. Now, then, the question will be, Whether any such offices, and particularly baptism, thus performed in contempt of authority, can be said to be valid or not? That it is not authoritatively performed is very plain: but does the thing done remain valid? or is it therefore absolutely null and void, because the heretical and schismatical priest had not

Digitized by Google

the authority of the bishops of the orthodox Church to perform it? If it be valid, then there may be a valid baptism where the administrator is not legally authorized to perform it. If it be simply invalid, and absolutely null and void, because administered by a heretical or schismatical priest, then all the difficulties return upon us that I have mentioned before, since our baptisms originally descend from the heretical and schismatical Church of Rome: which if our author thinks fit to deny to be a heretical or schismatical Church, I will undertake to shew it, upon the general principles of the Reformation. When these things are duly considered, they may, perhaps, have their proper influence upon this writer: at least I cannot but think that venerable body, who are competent judges in this matter, will make no new decree, that will either reflect upon the general practice of the Church, or make it so extremely difficult to defend the baptisms of the Church of England; as it needs must be upon the principles of this author, who asserts the nullity of heretical baptisms, as well as those of laymen, though the Church of England has no rule for rebaptizing either: and by her constant practice, which, in difficult cases, is the best interpreter of rules, has allowed the validity of both of them; as has been fully made out in the foregoing discourse. I shall add no more but the handsome rebuke which St. Jerome gave Hilary, the deacon, the *Deucalion orbis*, as he styles him, who was for rebaptizing all that had been baptized by heretics, when they came over to the unity of the Catholic Church: *Si hæretici baptisma non habent, et ideo rebaptizandi ab ecclesia sunt, quia in ecclesia non fuerunt, ipse quoque Hilarius non est Christianus: in ea quippe ecclesia baptizatus est, quæ semper ab hæreticis baptismum recepit.*[1]

Our author, I am told, understands Latin; and therefore I will leave him to translate this, and make the application.

[1] Dial. cont. Lucifer. c. ix. Venet. Vallars. vol. ii. p. 194, C. 5.

Digitized by Google

A

# SCHOLASTICAL HISTORY

OF THE

# PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH

IN REFERENCE TO THE

# ADMINISTRATION OF BAPTISM BY LAYMEN.

## PART II.

WITH

SOME CONSIDERATIONS ON DR. BRETT'S AND MR. LAWRENCE'S ANSWERS TO THE FIRST PART.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE

# AUTHOR'S DEDICATION.

---

TO THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE AND RIGHT REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,

## JONATHAN,

LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.

AND PRELATE OF THE MOST NOBLE ORDER OF THE GARTER.

---

MY LORD,

I CANNOT but take this opportunity to make my public acknowledgments for the late favour your lordship has been pleased to bestow upon me, as an encouragement to proceed in my laborious work of reducing the Antiquities of the Church into one body or view. It is no small satisfaction to me that I have hitherto proceeded with your lordship's approbation, not excepting my last dissertation upon the judgment and practice of the Church, in reference to the Baptism of Laymen, with which some, who



Digitized by Google

can bear no contradiction, have been pleased, without reason, to be offended; to whom, I hope, I have given abundant satisfaction in the present discourse. I did not, I confess, write the former part of this Scholastical History by your lordship's particular direction or command, though some have done me so great an honour as to say so: and I shall ever be proud of doing any thing that is good by the direction and command of my superiors: your lordship did not so much as know what subject I was upon, till it was finished; nor did I perfectly know your lordship's sentiments upon the point, till you were pleased to honour me with a letter of thanks for my book, and tell me that you exceedingly approved of it; and particularly that part of it, which treats of the deficiency of heretical and schismatical baptisms, and of the obligation those, who are so baptized, lie under to return to the unity of the Church, in order to have the defects of their baptism supplied by imposition of hands in confirmation; which was the usual way of supplying such defects, according to the general rule and practice of the ancient Church. Your lordship was pleased, also, to acquaint me, with what I did not understand before, that all the bishops of both provinces were unanimously of the same opinion, which I had defended, and thought there were other ways of supplying a faulty baptism, than by rebaptization, if given in due form by a layman. And though your lordship did not consent to subscribe the resolution, which was then intended to be drawn up, yet it was not because you dissented from them in the main of the deter-

Digitized by Google

mination, but because you thought it more proper to have added the words, "in cases of necessity;" which are cases less liable to exception, whose deficiency, whatever it be, may most certainly be rectified by Confirmation. And so far both the rules and practice of the Church of England, for these last two hundred years, are clear: for we have neither order nor example to encourage rebaptization in any such case, no, not after the rubric had confined the ministration of baptism wholly to the hands of a lawful minister. For still no rule was made, that such as were not baptized by a lawful minister, should be rebaptized; but they were required to receive the bishop's Confirmation, and then were admitted to the Eucharist, and the privilege of Christian burial, neither of which are allowed to unbaptized persons. Notwithstanding all this, I am charged by some as a false and self-interested writer; as one that is writing against the true Church of England; as an encourager of dissenters; because I would not suffer certain persons to represent the Church just as they pleased, and fix upon her such principles and practices as are peculiar to the dissenters only; because I would not join with them in advancing Cartwright's notions about rebaptization, against the Church of England, and revile and undervalue all the eminent bishops and doctors of the Church that have written heretofore in her defence, and learnedly defended her constitution; because I would not wire-draw the writers of the Primitive Church, and represent them as favourable to this novel hypothesis, when, without the greatest

Digitized by Google

injustice to them, and the world, and myself, I could not do it; because I would not allow all the heretics and schismatics of the Primitive Church, to be as true priests of God, and invested with as ample commission, power, and authority to baptize, when they were actually degraded, and removed from all sacerdotal offices by the discipline of the Church, as those Catholic priests who never were under any such censure. And yet upon this last point, upon which the whole controversy turns, and the whole discipline of the Church depends, the adversaries are strangely divided. One of them thinks, heretical and schismatical priests are safe under the protection of indelible character; that is, they can never be wholly divested of their sacerdotal commission, let the Church use what authority she can or will, to take it from them; their indelible character will still preserve their sacerdotal authority entire to them, and no power on earth can extend so far as to deprive them of the internal power of priests, whatever restraint she may lay upon the external exercise of their function. The other champion of the cause will not venture to go thus far, so to destroy all ecclesiastical discipline at a blow, and cut the very sinews of episcopal power in pieces. Which he is sensible must be the consequence, if they who grant the sacerdotal authority to priests, have not power, acting by the canons, to withdraw the same commission again, in case of heresy or schism, or any the like occasion. For then there is an end of all authority and power in the Church; and the ecclesiastical censures, when inflicted upon a delinquent bishop, or priest, to deprive

Digitized by Google

them of sacerdotal authority and power, is but a bugbear. Here, therefore, he deserts his fellow-disputant, and owns there is a real and effectual power in the Church to withdraw the sacerdotal commission from heretical and schismatical bishops and priests, and deprive them of their authority, and reduce them to the state of laymen: in which case, he confesses, their baptisms are as much unauthorized and uncommissioned as those of any other laymen. But then he pretends, that no Church, except the Cyprianic Churches, ever exercised this power against heretics and schismatics: though their commissions were delible, and the Church had power to delete them, yet no Church, besides the Cyprianic, ever actually deleted them. So that, according to him, heretics and schismatics were still acknowledged by the Church to be lawful priests, in actual and full commission; and the Church was so kind to them, even during their heresy and schism, as to leave them in full possession of their sacerdotal authority, and never withdraw her commission from them. Which is such a representation of the Primitive Church, and so grand a reflection on her discipline, as I believe no one ever made before him. But it was necessary to salve this gentleman's hypothesis, who otherwise must have been forced to own, that the Primitive Church did generally receive the baptism of heretics and schismatics, when given in due form, at the same time that she accounted them to be no priests, but actually deprived of their commission, and reduced to the state of laymen. For he is very sensible, and any one with half an eye may see it, that if the ancient

Digitized by Google

Church did actually by her discipline deprive heretics and schismatics of their commission, and thereby divest them of all sacerdotal authority and power; then they were no longer priests in that state, but reduced, by vacating their commission, to the degree and condition of laymen: and if the Church, notwithstanding this, received the baptisms of such heretics and schismatics without rebaptizing, then she must receive the baptism of such persons as had then no sacerdotal commission, being such as she herself had deprived of commission, and reduced to the state of laymen. The consequence is here so plain, that our author, on supposition the premises stand good, cannot pretend to deny it. All the dispute now, therefore, is reduced to this one point, Whether the ancient heretics and schismatics, whose baptisms the Primitive Church received and completed by confirmation, without a second baptism, were true authorized priests in actual commission, during their heresy or schism; or only nominal priests, whose commission was vacated by the same lawful episcopal power and authority, which first committed it to them? Our author does not dispute the power of the Church to vacate the commission of heretical or schismatical priests, but boldly affirms that no Churches, except the Cyprianic, ever actually exercised this discipline upon them, but left them still in full commission, and lawful possession of the power and authority of the priesthood. Which I have proved to be a grand mistake, and a grand reflection upon the discipline of the whole Catholic Church, and such an abetting of heretics and schismatics, as sets them upon the same

Digitized by Google

level with Catholic priests, which the Catholic Church never intended. For she always vacated the commission of heretical and schismatical priests, and by her just power and discipline took away all sacerdotal authority from them, leaving them in a state of unauthorized and uncommissioned laymen. This I have proved from such undeniable evidence from the ancient rules and canons of general and particular councils, and the practice and proceedings of the whole Catholic Church, that the contrary assertion must be the effect either of very great ignorance, or very great prejudice, and a resolution to serve a hypothesis, in any one that will venture to maintain it. The result, then, of the whole inquiry is this, that the Catholic Church was so far from abetting or encouraging the priesthood of heretics and schismatics, that she vacated and destroyed their commission, and reduced them, by her discipline, to a state of laymen: but yet she did not wholly cancel and disannul the unauthorized baptisms of those uncommissioned laymen or priests who had lost their commission; she did not order all men to be rebaptized, who were baptized by them; but only supplied what was irregular, unauthorized, and deficient, by her own just authority and power in a subsequent confirmation. And it is well known, that the practice of the Church of England, for these two hundred years, has been the very same; and few, besides professed dissenters from her, have offered to oppose it. Yet they, who now oppose her practice, and maintain the principle of dissenters, will needs outface the world, and bear all men down, that they are the only

Digitized by Google

true defenders of the Church who really desert her cause, and reflect upon her practice; and that they who defend her practice, and shew it to be agreeable to the practice of the whole Catholic Church, are men of ill designs; that they who will not allow the priesthood of heretics and schismatics to be as good as that of true Catholics, are enemies to Christ and the Christian priesthood; and that they who write in defence of the Church's discipline, both ancient and modern, are subverters of her constitution. I have lately received a letter from an unknown hand, which I shall beg leave to insert in this place.

Sir,—You will perhaps wonder to receive this from one that never saw you, and perhaps never may. But it is out of kindness to you, to let you know what (opinion) the true Church-of-England men have of you about us. Your *Origines*, &c., gained you a great reputation; and notwithstanding some mistakes incident to all mankind, you were looked upon as a member of the Church both willing and able to serve her. The news of your Scholastical History of Lay-Baptism being published, caused great joy to several about me, hoping so able a pen as yours would have set that matter in a clear light, and have ended a dispute, which has caused so much trouble to the Church, triumph to its adversaries, and a staggering in several well-meaning men: but, to our great surprise, it proved only a daubing, prevaricating piece, to recommend yourself to the moderate party, falsely so called, and their patrons, unfortunately crept into some of the highest places

Digitized by Google

in the Church. The world has long waited for your justification in answer to Mr. Lawrence, which, if you refuse to do, all mankind will impute it to your guilt, and that you own yourself a false and self-interested writer; which I do assure you is the opinion of

Your Servant,

TRUE DARBYSHIRE.

*London, Sept.* 22.

All I shall say in answer to this, is only, "Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you, falsely, for my sake: rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven." What reward I am to expect on earth for my service, I know not. What your lordship bestowed upon me, was for my former labours, and not for this: for you were pleased to give me the offer of it before ever my last book appeared in print, and before you yourself were acquainted with the purport of it. And I hope this gentleman, whoever he is, or his friends, will not be angry at your lordship for giving a little encouragement to the author of the *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*, "which gained him," he says, "a great reputation, and made him to be looked upon as a member of the Church, both willing and able to serve her." That may be sufficient to justify your lordship in bestowing your favour upon a person of such a character. But I have now spoiled all by writing a "daubing, prevaricating piece, to recommend myself to the moderate party, falsely so called, and their patrons,

Digitized by Google

unfortunately crept into some of the highest places in the Church." Some persons take a great latitude in distinguishing men and parties, and fixing names to them as they please; for which, perhaps, they may be accountable another day. I suppose now, every one that declares against rebaptization, is by this gentleman reckoned among his moderate party-men: and then I see not how your lordship, or the archbishop of York, or the bishop of Bath and Wells, will escape the imputation of being patrons of the moderate party; and that (in this gentleman's opinion) of having "unfortunately crept into some of the highest places in the Church," because you have, with many others, declared yourselves freely against rebaptization, as contrary to the sense and practice of the Catholic Church and the Church of England. But, perhaps, he had his eye more upon some others, when he spake of "moderate party-men and their patrons:" and if so, I can assure him, the author of the *Origines* had no occasion to write a "daubing, prevaricating piece" to recommend himself to them: having gained himself, by his former labours, a good esteem with them, as well as others; as writing what was of general use, and to general satisfaction. But my crime is, that I wrote against one, whom he calls Mr. Lawrence, for I myself must not, without a rebuke, presume to call him so; one who, in the opinion of this gentleman and his friends, is highly to be regarded: and unless I justify myself against him, all mankind will impute it to my guilt, and that I own myself "a false and self-interested writer." But, perhaps, he may be a little out in his computation.

Digitized by Google

For if I had never answered his book, all men would not have judged so hardly: there are many, who think it needs no answer; and others, who would have imputed not answering to other causes; to indisposition, or want of time, and avocation by other studies and labours; or a willingness not to insist too long upon such a debate, when I had a far greater work still upon my hand. But to prevent all further demands, the world has now my justification, whereby it will appear, who is the most faithful representer of the sense and practice of the Catholic Church; which I have, in this second part of the Scholastical History, delivered with such plain, full, and authentic evidence, as cannot fail of giving satisfaction to all such as will read without prejudice and with a design to inform themselves of the true discipline and practice of the ancient Church, in reference to the baptisms administered by declared heretics and schismatics, whom she accounted no more than laymen. If any men for doing this will call me again "a false and self-interested writer," they may use their pleasure: such reproaches will only teach me, that there are some men in the world, who are not to be obliged by any useful services, unless a man will give up his understanding to them, and write a history against the Church, in favour of their particular conceptions and opinions. Which I have never yet done, and, by the grace of God, never intend to do, though speaking truth expose me to a thousand worse reproaches. I cannot yet see any reason to espouse the principle of dissenters about rebaptization, against the Church; I have more

Digitized by Google

honour for the priesthood, than to put it into the hands of declared heretics and schismatics, against the discipline and practice of the six first general councils of the Church; which some, who call themselves the only true Churchmen, are forced to do, because their hypothesis obliges them to do it, lest they should be forced to confess the baptism of such heretics and schismatics to be no more than the baptism of laymen. Which if they once own, they know they must give up the argument drawn from the practice of the Catholic Church, which received the baptisms of heretics and schismatics, without rebaptizing, whilst she accounted the administrators to be no more than laymen. These things are so plainly demonstrated in the following discourse, that though I despair of convincing some men, yet I doubt not it will open the eyes of many, and give them rational satisfaction, as to what concerns the discipline of the Primitive Catholic Church; whose example, in this point of discipline, is now followed by the Church of England: both which, conjoined together, I have endeavoured to vindicate from the misrepresentations of those who, under colour of defending, manifestly oppose them both. I know, indeed, it is confidently pretended, by the adverse party, that they are writing in defence of the Church against the dissenters: but wise and considering men take this to be a very odd way of defending the Church, to espouse the professed principle of dissenters about rebaptizing, and maintain it against the Church's practice, and yet, after all, call this "defending the Church against the dissenters." They

Digitized by Google

say, indeed, they are persuading the dissenters to come into the Church, and be rebaptized, because lay-baptism is invalid: but this is only proving to them what they do not deny. For they assert the same thing, that lay-baptism is invalid, whilst the Church denies this by her constant practice. Therefore, instead of writing dissertations about the invalidity of lay-baptism, which they do not deny, they should convince dissenters that their ministers are only laymen; and then they would readily hearken to the doctrine of rebaptization, because this doctrine is according to their own principles: but as the matter stands at present, writing for the invalidity of lay-baptism, in the way that they do, is only writing against the Church, without any effect at all upon dissenters; who are convinced of nothing more thereby, than what they professed to believe before, that lay-baptism is invalid, which they always asserted and maintained against the Church, from the beginning of the Reformation. They pretend, further, to be maintaining the cause of the Primitive Church, and the Christian priesthood, against heretics, and schismatics, and other usurpers; when yet it is plain, they manifestly lodge the power of the priesthood in the hands of heretics and schismatics, which the ancient Church took from them: and they thereby misrepresent the discipline of the Church, as favouring the priesthood of heretics, which she utterly denied. So they give a secret wound to the Christian priesthood, and cast a blemish on the ancient discipline, even whilst they would appear to their admirers to be the only zealous and true defenders of

Digitized by Google

them. If these things be undeniably proved in the following discourse, then I hope it will a little abate the confidence of these gentlemen, and work them either into satisfaction or silence, when they find themselves so palpably mistaken about the priesthood of heretics, and the discipline of the ancient Church in relation to such a pretended priesthood. As I know no better way to end the present dispute about lay-baptism, so I hope it will not be unacceptable to your lordship or the world, to see the proceedings of the ancient councils against heretics and schismatics brought into one view, in order to illustrate this part of ancient history, and set it in a just light, pursuant to my general design of collecting and illustrating the Antiquities of the Christian Church; in which I have hitherto proceeded with your lordship's countenance and approbation, and hope to finish it under your encouragement and protection, who am,

My LORD,
Your most obliged,
most dutiful, and
obedient Servant,
JOSEPH BINGHAM.

1714.

Digitized by Google

# THE STATE OF THE PRESENT

# CONTROVERSY

## SECT. I.—*No further Dispute with Dr. Brett about the Modern Greek Church.*

WHEN I set myself to write the first part of this Scholastical History of Lay-Baptism, I did it with the same prospect and view as I have done all other parts of the Antiquities of the Church, only to set matters in as fair a light as I could, and inform the judgment of every unprejudiced reader; not without hopes of bringing an unhappy controversy to a fair end, by convincing some learned persons, who are warmly engaged in the dispute, that they were under some great mistakes, in reference to several points, both of ancient and modern history. And in some measure I have gained this end, though not so perfectly as I hope to do in this second part, in which I have taken care to give these gentlemen all imaginable satisfaction from the most authentic rules and undeniable practice of the Primitive Church, if the sense of the six first general councils, and the concurrent testimony of all other councils and Fathers, be of any force in such a case. Our controversy is now brought within a shorter compass: for I have no further dispute with my learned friend Dr. Brett, about the modern Greeks and Moscovites. All I have said of them, is allowed: only the doctor complains he had not books to examine upon this occasion, nor would the excellent library of Canterbury furnish him with necessary assistance. I hope his Grace of Canterbury, or the reverend dean and

Digitized by Google

chapter, will take his admonition to furnish their library with a Suicerus, and a Leunclavius, a Hottinger, and an Arcudius, &c., that the doctor may not be at a loss, when he is obliged to consult them upon any other such occasion.

SECT. II. — *Nor about the Churches of the Reformation.*

I have no further dispute with the doctor neither, about the Churches of the Reformation. We are agreed, that the Lutheran Churches are all of the same opinion with the Greeks, and allow lay-persons to baptize in cases of necessity. Zuinglius did the same, and his followers did not much depart from his opinion. The Palatine Churches forbid the rebaptization of those who are baptized by laymen in a grand dissipation of the Church, if Alting, an eminent professor among them, knew their sense in such an exigency. The French and Dutch Churches are of the contrary opinion, and order all persons to be rebaptized that are baptized by laymen in any case whatsoever. Calvin was of the same opinion with Alting, that lay-baptism might be admitted without rebaptization in a grand dissipation of the Church. And what the doctor quotes from him, only respects order in a quiet and peaceable state of the Church. The doctor will have it also, that the Scotch Church followed the French at the Reformation: and though he does not prove it from any piece of their discipline, or from Knox, or any private writer (for I think Knox's Book of Discipline, in Bishop Spotswood, has nothing about it); yet I will not contend with him about this particular, having as little proof against his assertion as he has for it; and it would be only to fight in the dark, to say any thing further without authority upon it.

SECT. III. — *How far we are agreed about the Church of England.*

Thus far, then, our dispute seems to be at an end. But there are two points about which the doctor is not satisfied; the sense of the Church of England and the Primitive Church. To what I said about the Church of England, he gives a very short answer, that I have said nothing but

Digitized by Google

what was said some time before, in a small pamphlet, called, 'The Judgment of the Church of England in the Case of Lay-Baptism,' which was fully answered by Mr. Lawrence, to which he therefore refers his reader; and only observes further, that I gave the opinion of private men only, and not the judgment of the Church from any of her rubrics, articles, or canons. So that, though I had alleged a thousand authorities more than the little pamphlet, called, 'The Judgment,' had done, or should now allege a thousand more; the same insinuation, that I had added nothing new, would answer all in a word. For it signifies nothing to this gentleman to produce the unanimous consent of private writers, in every age since the Reformation, declaring their judgment of the sense of the Church of England in this matter. The constant practice of the Church, which is obvious to every one that has but half an eye, is of no more weight with him: for unless he sees express rubrics, articles, or canons, forbidding to rebaptize, he will not believe it to have been the sense or judgment of the Church of England. So that it is in vain to add any more Whitgifts, or Abbots, or Whitakers, or Casaubons, father or son, or the judgment of the universities, or the judgment of the prince in a conference of bishops: all these were but private men, and cannot tell us what was the judgment of the Church in their times. Nay, according to the new hypothesis, some of them were not baptized Christians, but only in the state of catechumens: for Casaubon, I suppose, was baptized by a French minister, and therefore, according to this hypothesis, ought to have been rebaptized, when he first joined himself to the Church of England. And it has already been observed by others, that the royal martyr was baptized by a Scotch presbyter only, and therefore, by the same hypothesis, ought to have had a new baptism to make him a complete Christian. But it is vain to urge any absurdities that attend this new hypothesis: for be the consequences what they will, or be the authorities and testimonies never so full and ample for the Church's practice, yet unless articles, rubrics, or canons, be produced, that plainly say such persons ought not to be rebaptized, the gentlemen that



Digitized by Google

maintain the new hypothesis, resolve never to depart from it. The constant practice of the Church is not thought sufficient to interpret her rubrics: nor the concurring judgment of the sons of the Church allowed to be any indication of the sense of their mother. And, therefore, if I should here add, that most of, if not all, the bishops of the present Church, have either publicly or privately given their opinion and judgment in favour of the Church's general practice, this would be reckoned to have no weight, because it is not improved into a rubric or canon of the Church. But a rubric or an article, however misunderstood or wrong applied, is of sufficient force to bear down all other authority, whether from general consent or general practice. So that I think it in vain to dispute with Dr. Brett, or any other of his way, any longer upon this head, who refuse to be determined by any other evidence but such as they think cannot possibly be brought against them: I only take what is allowed, that the general consent of private writers, and the general practice of the Church interpreting her own rules, is clearly against them: and then leave the rest to be determined by the judgment of every ingenuous reader.

## Sect. IV. — *How far we are agreed about the Primitive Writers.*

But I have something more to say to my friend, Dr. Brett, about the sense and practice of the Primitive Church. For here I intend to give him satisfaction in his own way, and answer all his demands, and offer him such proof and conviction as will once more try his ingenuity, whether he will take it kindly to be informed in a matter of historical truth, by the evidence of the plainest demonstration. I will trouble him now with no private writers, but such as are backed by the authority of general councils. In the former discourse, I alleged only private writers; and those, though they spake never so plain, were all answered in a word, that they delivered only their own private sense, and not the sense of the Church. When the testimony of Tertullian was urged, it was easily turned off, by saying, he only spake his

Digitized by Google

own opinion. When I added to this the decree of the Council of Eliberis; that is answered by saying, it was not a general, but only a provincial council. When it was further urged, that Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, received the baptisms given by Athanasius; that is rejected as a fable and a mere hear-say story, because it had no better authority than Sozomen or Ruffin. When I urged the plainest words imaginable from St. Jerome, I am told, that these proceeded only from a slip of St. Jerome's pen, whilst he transcribed Tertullian, and is directly contrary to every other part of his Dialogue against the Luciferians. St. Austin has no better quarter; for he is rejected as one, that only speaks his private opinion, and that built upon a wrong foundation, viz. the absolute necessity of baptism to salvation; which is said neither to be agreeable to the doctrine of the Catholic Church nor the Church of England. And yet St. Austin, in truth, had no other opinion of the necessity of baptism in adult persons, whatever he might think of children, but what Cyprian, and St. Ambrose, and all the whole Catholic Church, had of it before him; and makes the same allowances, in the case of necessity, as the Church of England does at this day, as I shall undeniably prove in the next book of my *Origines*,[a] however the doctor is so confident to the contrary. But something was necessary to be said to lessen the character and authority of St. Austin. The same answer is given to Gelasius and Isidore of Seville, that the permission they spake of, as granted, in the Western Church, to laymen to baptize in case of necessity, was all founded upon the same mistaken opinion of St. Austin about the absolute necessity of baptism, which prevailed by St. Austin's great authority in the Western Church. This is the unhappy method, which this learned person takes to obviate the force of my former dissertation; sometimes lessening the character of historians as over credulous; charging others as writing in a dream, and letting their pen run too fast; and others, of great and venerable name, as guilty of heterodoxy, in running against the general sense of the Catholic Church: and all of them, put together, whether they spake true or false, are no

[a] Origin. Eccles. book x. chap. ii. sect. xx. See vol. iii. p. 297.

Digitized by Google

sufficient evidence of the practice of the Church, in his opinion, because they spake no more but their own private sense of the matter. And this is a solution ready at hand for a thousand authors, had they been alleged to the same purpose. So that unless we can produce some general councils determining the validity of lay-baptism in the cases under debate, or at least some authors of indisputable credit, that say general councils have so determined; the doctor will still find his evasion, and desire to be excused from yielding his assent to it. Now some persons would be apt to complain of this as hard usage, for men to require the evidence of general councils to determine a matter of fact on one side, when the other side will not produce a patriarchal, or a national, or so much as a provincial council on the other hand. They would be ready to say, this was to bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on other men's shoulders, whilst they themselves will not touch them with one of their fingers. But I will make no such complaint, but gratify my friend in his demands, and try whether I cannot convince him, that this matter has been abundantly determined by all the six general councils, when I have first examined how he pretends to prove his opinion to be agreeable to the general sense and practice of of the Church.

SECT. V.—*Whether St. Basil and the Council of Trullo determine the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, in the Practice of the Church.*

His main strength is from the testimony of St. Basil, whose opinion, he says (p. 59), is not to be esteemed a private opinion; for the epistle, wherein it is contained, is a canonical epistle, and received by the Greek Church as a canon, and as such is put into the canonical code of that Church, and was so as early as the sixth century at least; about which time Johannes Scholasticus, patriarch of Constantinople, made his collection of all the canons then received in that Church, among which are the canonical epistles of St. Basil. So that when we cite an epistle of St. Basil, we do not produce the authority of a single father,

Digitized by Google

but of the whole Greek Church. This is his argument, which will do the doctor's cause much more harm than good; for if he stands to it, his cause is utterly lost. I examine not how early St. Basil's canons were made a part of the Greek Code, whether in the time of Johannes Scholasticus, who lived two hundred years after St. Basil, or afterward: the first general council that confirmed them, I believe, was the Council of Trullo, an. 692. And if they had no complete authority till that time, they are no very good authority or testimony of the Church's general practice for the three hundred years foregoing. But what is it that St. Basil's canons are made to testify of the Church's practice? Is it not first, that heretics and schismatics were only reputed laymen? Which is true; not because St. Basil said it, or because his canons were received by the Church two or three hundred years after they were made; but because the Church has decreed the same thing in all her general Councils; as I have abundantly proved in the following discourse, not to serve the doctor's hypothesis, but to do him more true and and useful service, in setting him right in his notions about lay-baptism, so far as concerns the Church's practice. For, secondly, the Church never came in to St. Cyprian's or St. Basil's notion in the other part of it, that the baptisms of heretics and schismatics, who were only laymen or not so good as laymen, were therefore to be repeated, because they were laymen; but expressly determined the contrary, that their baptisms, if given in due form, were to be received by imposition of hands without rebaptizing, notwithstanding that they were given by those, whom the Church herself accounted no more than laymen. How, then, is it possible for St. Basil's canons to testify that to be the practice of the whole Church, when the Church, in her general councils, does for herself so evidently testify the contrary? I do not accuse my friend of insincerity, but I cannot wholly acquit him of want of a due sagacity and judgment, in making St. Basil a witness of the Church's practice in a case, wherein the Church always went against him. For though she agreed with him in the first proposition, that heretics and schismatics were no better than

Digitized by Google

laymen; yet she differed from him in the other assertion, that therefore the baptisms of those laymen, though given in due form, were to be repeated: the one affirmed it, the other denied it: and, therefore, unless an affirmation and a negation be the same thing, we cannot possibly say, with any colour of reason or truth, that St. Basil's canons witness or affirm that to be the general practice of the Church, which all the canons of the Church positively deny. But the ground of the doctor's mistake was this; he did not consider, that St. Basil's canons went one way in this particular, and and the canons of the Church another; but hastily concludes, that because St. Basil's canons were received into the code of the Greek Church, and that two or three hundred years after they were made, therefore the Church universal must needs always practise according to those canons: whereas this is a very wrong conclusion; for even when these canons were received into the Code, the Church did not practise according to them, but according to her own general rules, which were directly contrary. Nothing can be plainer than this from the Council of Trullo, which, in her second canon, receives the canons of St. Basil among those of Athanasius, Gregory Thaumaturgus, and many others: and yet she has a canon of her own, expressly contradicting this canon of St. Basil, which so much weight is laid upon. For her 95th canon orders some heretics to be received by a new baptism, and others only by imposition of hands or consignation. The Eunomians, the Montanists, the Sabellians, the Manichees, the Valentinians, the Marcionites, the Paulianists, and such others, were to be rebaptized, for a reason that every body knows, because they observed not the due form of baptism: but the Arians, the Macedonians, the Novatians, the Quartadecimans, the Apollinarians, the Nestorians, and Eutychians, are to be received only by anathematizing their errors and consignation. This canon is plainly contrary to that of St. Basil. Now, then, if a man were to judge of the Church's practice at this time, by one of these two canons, whether of them would it be more proper to take for his guide, the canon of St. Basil, or the canon of this general council? I can hardly think any man so weak, as to

Digitized by Google

declare upon a fair hearing, that this Council intended the obsolete canon of St. Basil should take place of their own canon just then made, and stifle it in its very birth, only because they gave St. Basil's canons a decent reception in the lump, as they did many others, which were then no rules of practice. Sure it must be concluded, this Council spake the sense of the Church at that time in her own canon: and if other councils did the same before her, up to St. Basil's time, and all against St. Basil's rule, it must be monstrous to conclude what was the practice of the Church from St. Basil's single canon, rather than from so many canons of general councils to the contrary. But the doctor will ask, What general council has said, that the baptisms of laymen are to be received in any case without rebaptizing? I answer, as many as have said that the baptisms of heretics and schismatics are to be received, when given in due form, without rebaptizing. For they had no other notion of heretics and schismatics, when once degraded or excommunicated, but only either as laymen, or worse than laymen, by being cast out of the Church. This was no private opinion of St. Cyprian, or St. Basil, as the other opinion about rebaptizing such heretics was, but it is the voice of the Church in all her general councils; it is confirmed by the decrees and sanctions of almost every patriarchial, national, provincial council; it runs through the writings of every Catholic father, who all combine in this one point against heretics and schismatics, that they are no longer true, authorized priests of God, but only laymen, or a degree below laymen: as I shall abundantly shew the doctor in the sequel of this discourse. The plain consequence of which is, that the Church in ordering the baptisms of such heretics and schismatics to be received, must needs receive the baptisms of unauthorized laymen, because she received the baptisms of those whom she either made laymen, or accounted them so to be, as is irrefragably proved in the following discourse. The controversy now is brought into a short compass, it turns all upon this one point at present, whether heretics and schismatics be true, authorized priests of God, that can never be divested of their authority, by virtue of an

Digitized by Google

indelible character;—or, whether, by their apostasy, and the Church's censure, they are not rather divested of all ministerial authority, and reduced to the state of laymen, or one degree below laymen, that continue in the Church? When I have determined this point by the best authority in the Church, by the acts and canons of the six first general councils, and by such arguments as are proper to be urged in this case, my learned friend and I shall have no longer occasion to dispute about this or that private author, which will signify little to be urged on either side against the whole stream and current of the Catholic Church. If I do not satisfy him by this plain history, let him give me better proofs for the contrary part; and I will promise him, in point of history, to become his convert.

But before I have done with St. Basil, I will make the doctor two or three more observations out of him, which are obvious enough, though he did not think fit to observe them. As, 1. That St. Basil, or at least St. Cyprian and Firmilian, whose opinion he relates, were not possessed with the modern notion of the indelible character of a priest: they thought, that when a bishop or a presbyter turned heretics or schismatics, they were no longer priests, but laymen; not like laymen, or parallel to them, though that were enough, but perfectly and entirely laymen, and no priests: which is the foundation of their argument for rebaptizing those that were baptized by them. Their words are very express, λαϊκοὶ γενόμενοι, that heretics and schismatics, by breaking off from the Church, 'become laymen,' and therefore have not the authority of priests any longer. Now, if we suppose, with the doctor, that St. Basil's canons were entirely confirmed by the Church universal, then it is evident the modern notion of an indelible character was no doctrine of the Catholic Church, no more than it was of St. Basil; but that a bishop or a priest may forfeit his episcopal or sacerdotal authority and power, and be reduced, by the discipline of the Church for his crimes, whether heresy, schism, or other crimes, to the state and condition of laymen; which I have proved to be true, not because St. Basil said it, or because his canons were received by the Church,

Digitized by Google

but because it was the constant and avowed doctrine and discipline of the Church universal.

2. Whence it follows, secondly, that such priests, having lost their authority, could have no more power than laymen to baptize, as St. Basil rightly observes, and that consonantly enough to the sense and received opinion of the Catholic Church; of which I shall give a full account in the following discourse.

3. And yet I observe, thirdly, that as to the particular case of schismatics, whom St. Basil reckons laymen as well as heretics, though in his own private opinion he was for rebaptizing them as well as heretics, yet he is not stiff to that opinion, but thinks the custom of the Church in every country ought to be complied with, whether it were to baptize, or not baptize them again. And he particularly applies this to the case of the Novatians, and such other schismatics as did not err in faith, and were not wholly broken off from the Church in fundamentals. Therefore, since many Churches in Asia received the baptism of such by way of dispensation, he is not against the receiving of it. So that, in his opinion, if the Church thinks fit to receive lay-baptism, it is in her power to admit of it. And so he determines, not only in his first canon, but in the forty-seventh also, in the case of the Encratitæ.

4. And, therefore, I observe in the last place, that according to these rules of St. Basil, the decrees of general councils, and the common consent and practice of the Church in these matters, were to be complied with. So that the Council of Nice having received the baptism of the Novatians, though they were both in St. Basil's opinion, and, in reality, but laymen; and the Council of Constantinople, not long after St. Basil's death, having determined the same about the Novatians and several others; in all such Churches as submitted to the authority of those Councils, no further dispute was to be made about this matter: but either the directions of the councils or the custom of every Church were to be regarded by all private men, and no disturbance to be made upon this point of discipline. All which things considered, it cannot be concluded from St. Basil's canons, or their

Digitized by Google

reception in the Church, that laymen's baptism was generally annulled; but we must necessarily conclude the contrary, that since heretics and schismatics, both in the opinion of St. Basil and the Church, were generally voted to be laymen; and yet the baptisms of these laymen were generally received by public orders of the Church; that, therefore, the general practice of the Church was, to receive the baptisms of laymen, if given in due form, without rebaptizing. So unhappy is my learned friend in his conclusions from the ancient fathers, to urge that for his cause, which directly proves the contrary.

SECT. VI.— *An Account of the Luciferian Heresy. And whether St. Jerome be a Witness of the Church's annulling the Baptism of Laymen in ordinary Cases?*

Let us see whether he be any happier in his other great pillar and support of his cause, which is St. Jerome. The doctor does not pretend that St. Jerome was wholly on his side, but only in one point. He owns St. Jerome allowed laymen to baptize in case of necessity: but then he says he contradicted himself, and spake not the sense of the Church neither, but only the private opinion of Tertullian against the Church; though St. Jerome speaks in terms plain enough,[b] *Quod frequenter, si tamen necessitas cogit, scimus etiam licere laicis*, 'We know that it is frequently allowed to laymen to baptize, when necessity requires it.' This, sure, was not the allowance of Tertullian or St. Jerome, but the allowance of the Church, which authorized laymen to do it frequently in such extraordinary cases. Or if they did it frequently without her authority; it is not to be imagined but that the Church should have made some decree against it; especially when St. Austin, and the Council of Eliberis, and several others, had declared for it. Here was reason enough to expect some general council should have interposed her authority, as she did in another case against the Cyprianists, and have forbidden laymen to baptize in any case whatsoever, if it had been against the

[b] Venet. Vallars. vol. ii. p. 182, A. 8.

Digitized by Google

sense and discipline of the Church to allow it. But the doctor does not pretend to give us any general council to this purpose. But still he will have it, that the Church always rebaptized those that were baptized by laymen in ordinary cases; and that St. Jerome herein is a witness of the Church's practice. Now, to convince the doctor of his mistake, I will only ask him two plain questions. First, Whether the Church ever made any general decree for rebaptizing such as were baptized in due form by heretics and schismatics? or whether St. Jerome ever speaks of any such decree? I know my learned friend will not assert this, because I have proved the contrary before to his satisfaction. I ask then, secondly, Whether the Church, by any general council, ever declared, that heretics and schismatics, whilst they remained heretics and schismatics, were true, authorized priests of God; or whether St. Jerome ever alleges any such decree? If he says there are such declarations and decrees of general councils, it will be easy to produce them; as I have done abundance to the contrary in the following discourse. But if he can produce none that say this, but all unanimously, on the contrary, declare that heretics and schismatics are no longer true priests of God, but laymen, or of a lower order than laymen, in the Church; then it inevitably follows, that the Church, in ordering the baptism of heretics and schismatics to be received, ordered the baptism of those to be received, who were no more than laymen, in her opinion. If he says St. Jerome is a witness that the Church esteemed heretics and schismatics to be true priests of God, it will be easy to produce his testimony: but then, all that will be gained by it, will be only this, that St. Jerome contradicts the general councils, and delivers a private mistaken opinion of his own, which, in that case, can be no sufficient testimony or evidence of the Church's sense, against the clearer and stronger evidence of her general councils.

This, without any more ado, will be allowed to be a sufficient answer to any thing the doctor has produced, or can produce, out of St. Jerome's Dialogue against the Luciferians. And so I might here put an end to the dispute

Digitized by Google

about it. But because that Dialogue is a very intricate discourse, in the former part of it, and the doctor has chosen that part of it to be the foundation of his assertion, I will, for the satisfaction of the learned reader, make a little further inquiry into the design of that Dialogue; and state, as fully and exactly as I can, the case between St. Jerome and the Luciferians. The first rise of the Luciferian schism is well known to have proceeded from the inflexible stiffness and rigour of Lucifer, bishop of Caralis, in Sardinia, who, having been a confessor for the faith against the Arians, in the time of Constantius, thought it unreasonable, when the persecution was over, that those three hundred bishops, who had so far complied with the Arians, in the Council of Ariminum, as to consent to the dropping of the word, 'consubstantial' out of the Creed, should be allowed to continue in their places any longer, as having, in his opinion, betrayed the faith and the cause of the Catholic Church. Hereupon, as soon as the Council of Alexandria, under Athanasius (an. 362), had determined to receive these bishops again in their station, because they found no just reason to depose them; Lucifer, offended at this, in his over-righteous and over-wise zeal, made a separation from the Church, and would no longer communicate either with those lapsed bishops, or those that received them; declaring that the whole Catholic Church was become an apostatizing harlot and the synagogue of antichrist, for receiving them. This occasioned several questions to be debated by St. Jerome; some of which he answers categorically and directly, and also upon Catholic principles; others only hypothetically, in pursuance of his adversary's suppositions or assertions: and in these last he does not always speak his own sense, or the sense of the Church, but only shews his adversary what must follow upon the advancement of such a false principle or assertion, to drive him to an absurdity. If men will not carefully distinguish these things, it is impossible to understand this Dialogue of St. Jerome, or make the sense of one part of it consistent with another.

Now the questions proposed were such as these:—

Digitized by Google

1. Whether the Arians and other heretics were heathens? This the Luciferians affirmed, but St. Jerome denied.

2. Whether, upon this supposition of their being heathens, they could give such a Christian baptism as needed not to be repeated? This the Luciferians affirmed, but St. Jerome positively denied upon that supposition: for no heathen, none but a baptized person, could give Christian baptism. And yet, when the question was otherwise proposed,

3. Whether an Arian heretic, considered absolutely as a baptized person, and not upon the Luciferian supposition of being a mere heathen, could give such a baptism as needed not to be repeated by the Church? Then St. Jerome not only affirmed, but maintained it from Scripture and councils, that heretical baptism, when given in due form, was not to be repeated. By which we may see that St. Jerome affirmed and denied the same thing, upon different suppositions, without any contradiction.

4. The next question was, Whether any beside a priest could baptize? The Luciferian asserted, any man, an Arian, that is, in his opinion, a heathen, one that was no priest nor Christian, might baptize. But St. Jerome denied all this, and asserted, that it was necessary a man should, in some sense, be a Christian priest, to qualify him to baptize. But he distinguishes a double notion of the priesthood, and cases ordinary from extraordinary. There is the *sacerdotium laici*, as he calls it, 'the priesthood of a layman;' that is, his baptism, as well as the priesthood of a clerk, which qualified the one to administer baptism in extraordinary cases, as the other did in ordinary. And without a priesthood of one sort or other, there could be no ministration of baptism. Therefore if the Arians were heathen, as the Luciferian asserted, their laics were to be rebaptized as Gentiles; since a heathen could not be a priest either in the strict or the large notion of a priest, nor consequently baptize either in ordinary or extraordinary cases. Here again St. Jerome disputes hypothetically upon the principles and assertions of the Luciferians.

5. Another question was, Whether any man could administer baptism, who could not give remission of sins, and the Spirit with it? The Luciferian affirms it, but St. Jerome

Digitized by Google

denies it. And here, I confess, I am at loss to understand St. Jerome's reasoning, and make him speak agreeably to the doctrine of the Catholic Church; and if my learned friend will help me out, he will do both me and St. Jerome a piece of service. For I am sure St. Austin always argues against the Cyprianists and the Donatists upon a contrary notion, that a true baptism might be given without remission of sins or the Spirit accompanying it. For heretics had not power to give either remission of sins or the Spirit. This was the deficiency of their baptism; and for this reason, all the councils ordered heretics to receive imposition of hands upon their return to the Church, that they might receive remission of sins and the Spirit, which they could not receive before in heretical baptism: as I have abundantly proved before in the first part of my Scholastical History, which the doctor does not pretend to call in question. How, therefore, to reconcile St. Jerome's notion to the rule of the Church, in this particular, is beyond my skill at present; and I will thank any one that will do it for me.

6. Another question, which indeed is the principal and leading question in this whole Dialogue, though it was only about a matter of fact, was, Whether the bishops of the Council of Ariminum were really Arians or not? The Luciferian affirmed it, but Jerome utterly denies it; and proves clearly, from the history and acts of the Council then extant, and to which he appeals, that they were all Catholic bishops, and only subscribed a Catholic creed in a Catholic sense: but Ursatius and Valens, two deceitful and crafty Arian bishops, had prevailed upon them, with fair words, to leave the word 'consubstantial' out of the Creed, for the sake of peace, pretending that then all would be well, and there would be no more disputes about religion. Which they had no sooner done, but these deceitful Arians immediately gave out and boasted, that they had destroyed the Nicene faith. Which as soon as the bishops of Ariminum came to understand, they, with tears, detested and abhorred the fraud, declaring, by all that is sacred, they never intended to make an Arian creed, as these miscreants gave out against them. Then *ingemuit totus orbis, et*

Digitized by Google

*Arianum se esse miratus est;* which does not mean, as it is vulgarly misunderstood, that these three hundred bishops were Arians, or that the world was turned Arian with them, but that these bishops were really grieved that they should, by such a trick, be brought under the suspicion of Arianism, who never intended any such thing. Thus St. Jerome does justice to these Catholic bishops, in freeing them from the imputation of Arianism, which Lucifer, after Ursatius and Valens, had cast upon them. He owns they were to blame for leaving out the word 'consubstantial,' which the Nicene Council had made the barrier of the faith; but that they had established an Arian creed, he utterly denies: and therefore he vindicates the Church against Lucifer, in allowing them to continue in their station. "For why," says he,[c] "should they have condemned those, who were not Arians? Why should they divide the Church, whilst it continued in the unity of the faith? Why should they, by their obstinacy, make those become Arians, who were really orthodox believers?" "The Council of Alexandria," he adds, "upon this account only condemned the authors of the heresy, who were not to be excused; but received the rest upon their repentance: not as if they could have been bishops, if they had been heretics; but because it was so manifest, that those who were received, never had been heretics."

In these last words, St. Jerome seems to me to determine two other questions, which were,

7. Whether, upon supposition that those bishops had been really professed Arians, they ought to have been esteemed true bishops, whilst they were heretics? And,

8. Whether, in strictness of discipline, the Church would or could have received them to the station of bishops again, upon the renunciation of their heresy, without breaking in upon her own ordinary standing rule, which

[c] Hieron. Dial. cont. Lucif. c. vii. Cur damnassent eos qui Ariani non erant? Cur ecclesiam scinderent, in concordia fidei permanentem? Cur denique credentes bene, obstinatione sua facerent Arianos?——In Alexandrina synodo constitutum est, ut exceptis auctoribus hæreseos, quos error excusare non poterat, pœnitentes ecclesiæ sociarentur: non quod episcopi possint esse, qui hæretici fuerant; sed quod constaret eos qui reciperentur, hæreticos non fuisse. (Venet. Vallars. vol. ii. p. 192, C.; and 193, D.)

Digitized by Google

was to deprive all such as fell into heresy, of the office of bishops and the clerical priesthood? St. Jerome seems to me plainly to determine these two questions in the negative, in those words,[d] *Non quod episcopi esse possint, qui hæretici fuerant*, 'They could not ordinarily be allowed to be bishops who had been heretics.' For this I shall shew to be exactly agreeable to the common and ordinary rules of the Church, which were, neither to allow of heretics as true bishops or priests, whilst they were heretics; nor yet, in strictness of discipline, to admit them as bishops or priests upon their return to the Catholic Church, but only to allow them to communicate in the quality of laymen.

9. But then there was another main question, upon which St. Jerome and the Luciferian are absolutely divided, which was, Whether the Church, for weighty and prudential reasons, could not dispense with the strictness and rigour of her own ordinary rule of discipline? That is, Whether the Church, if she thought fit, could not give authority to a heretical bishop to act as a bishop again, upon his return from his heresy to the Church? This was stiffly denied by Lucifer; and it was the thing he grounded his schism upon. But St. Jerome, with a great deal of reason and eloquence, maintains this dispensing power of the Church, and her prudence in receding sometimes from the rigour of discipline, upon just and proper occasions. He argues this (chap. ii.) from the practice of the Luciferians themselves, who admitted Arian laymen without rebaptizing them, upon a prudential reason,—because no one would be converted, if he knew he must be rebaptized; and so they should have been the cause of their ruin, if they had absolutely rejected them. Hence St. Jerome argues, that if such a concession was made in receiving a layman, to save a single soul, there was much more reason to do it in receiving of a bishop, who, by his return, might unite not only a city, but a whole province, to the Church; but if he was refused, he might draw many others with him into destruction. He argues further (chap. vii.), from the example of the Nicene Council, which allowed eight Arian bishops to continue in their

[d] See note in preceding page.

Digitized by Google

places, when they might have rejected them without any danger to the Church: and it were much if the Church should not be obliged to do that to save the whole world, which the Council of Nice did voluntarily, when she had no such fear or concern upon her. So that, according to St. Jerome, the Church had power to receive lapsing bishops to their station again, if prudential reasons required it, though this was receding a little from the ordinary discipline in the exactness and rigour of it. And this was the grand debate betwixt Lucifer and the Church. Lucifer would make no allowance or abatement for extraordinary occasions, but was for standing stiff to the rule prefixed for ordinary cases, whatever was the consequence.

10. And this drew him into another great error;—that the whole Church was polluted and profaned by receiving those bishops whom he thought Arians, into their office and station again. This made the whole world become the devil's possession, and turned the Church into a harlot's house, and the synagogue of Satan; and there were no true Christians left but in the Isle of Sardinia, where Lucifer governed them. This strange, uncharitable opinion St. Jerome excellently refutes and exposes in the first and eighth chapters of his Dialogue.

11. Hilary, the Roman deacon, went one step further, and added to all this, that the Church was not only polluted, but that all that were baptized by heretics, were of necessity to be rebaptized again, in order to make them Christians: which was more than his master, Lucifer, had asserted. Against this, St. Jerome disputes in the two last chapters of his Dialogue, from the authority of Scripture, and the Council of Nice, and the practice of the Church, and the authority of Lucifer himself; who received those that were baptized by the Arians, though he would not consent to receive the clergy to their ancient stations. Which shews, that when St. Jerome disputes against the baptism of the Arians, in the former part of the Dialogue, he speaks not absolutely his own or the Church's sense, but only discourses hypothetically upon the principles, suppositions, and assertions, of his adversaries, to shew them the absurdities and



Digitized by Google

unreasonable consequences of their opinions; if, as they said, the Arians were heathens, then they ought to rebaptize those that were baptized by them; for no heathen could give Christian baptism.

It is by this key, by carefully distinguishing what St. Jerome speaks absolutely as his own plain opinion, from what he discourses only hypothetically upon the opinions of his adversaries, that any one must pretend to understand the easy part of his discourse: and for that which is extremely difficult in it, as I pretend not to be master of it, so I had rather be a disciple than a teacher to others, in what I profess not to understand; as I do not that part of his discourse, where he seems to say there can be no true baptism without remission of sins and the gift of the Spirit; which I cannot reconcile with the sense of the Catholic Church, nor with the validity of heretical baptism, which St. Jerome himself pleads for against Hilary, the deacon. Nor can I reconcile some other intricate discourse of his with the Luciferian, to the common known rule and practice of the Church; which yet my learned friend takes to be plain indications, not only of his own opinion, but also of the Church with him, that lay-baptism, in ordinary cases, is wholly null and void. Nay, he is so confident as to say (p. 63), "If it is not demonstrable from that Dialogue, that St. Jerome maintained the baptism of laymen, in ordinary cases at least, howsoever it might possibly be allowed in extraordinary cases, not only to be unlawful, but also wholly invalid, and consequently to be repeated; he will yield the cause."

Now one would expect presently to see as plain words for this, as I had given for the lawfulness of laymen's baptizing in cases of necessity; but in vain: for all the doctor pretends to allege, is not the assertion in plain terms, but some little appearance of it from two or three passages of St. Jerome, where it is not certain whether he speaks absolutely either his own sense, or the Church's sense, but only hypothetically, upon the suppositions of his adversaries. The thing which the doctor labours to demonstrate out of St. Jerome, is, that the Arian bishops were true bishops, and not laymen: for otherwise he knows not how to justify the

Digitized by Google

Church's receiving such as were baptized by them, without rebaptizing. Now, I cannot but observe, in the first place, that he is the most unfortunate man in the world at demonstration: for he brings two demonstrations which contradict and destroy one another. Not long ago we heard him demonstrating, out of St. Basil, and that in the name of the whole Church, that all heretics and schismatics are only laymen: and here we have him demonstrating out of St. Jerome, and that in the name of the Church too, that the Arian heretics are true bishops and priests, and not laymen. Now how will these things consist together? What distinction in the schools can free them from a contradiction? And whether must the reader hearken to the doctor demonstrating out of St. Basil, or St. Jerome? For my part, I have already said, that I think his demonstration out of St. Basil comes nearer the Church's sense of heretics and schismatics, that they were not esteemed bishops and priests, but only laymen; not because the doctor has solidly proved it, but because I have, in this discourse, more substantially done it for him. And this is a sufficient prejudice against his pretended demonstration out of St. Jerome, in the opinion of any wise and sober man, and might be a justifiable reason for dismissing it without any further examination. But because my friend shall not complain of my incivility, that I would not give both his demonstrations a fair hearing; and because it will be of some use to the learned reader to set all things right about St. Jerome; I will examine it a little more closely, and here follow the doctor, κατὰ πόδα.

He says (p. 64), "If St. Jerome's main topic, on which he builds all his arguments, was not then the known sense and practice of the Catholic Church, his controversy with the Luciferian was about his own private opinion." And so it might be for any thing the doctor has said to the contrary. For I have shewed before, that in one point St. Jerome plainly maintained a private opinion against the sense of the Church, when he said, there could be no true baptism without remission of sins and the grace of the Spirit conferred therein; which tends to disannul all heretical baptisms whatsoever. And if St. Jerome maintained a private opinion in this point, why might he not do so in any other? and

Digitized by Google

particularly in the point of the invalidity of lay-baptism, if that had been really his opinion; as I think it really was not.

But he says, "This was not only his opinion, but the main point which he defended, viz. the invalidity of lay-baptism, and that such as had been so invalidly baptized, ought to receive the true baptism of the Church: and hence," he says, "it follows, that this doctrine was at that time the known sense and practice of the Catholic Church." Whether this was the sense and practice of the Catholic Church, we shall see more hereafter: at present I only observe, that the invalidity of lay-baptism was not the main point defended by St. Jerome, if it was defended at all. For any one that reads the account I have given before of the questions debated by St. Jerome, will easily perceive, that the main point of all, and the very leading question to all the rest was, Whether the bishops of the Council of Ariminum were really Arian heretics or not? And next to that was, Whether there was any dispensing power in the Catholic Church to receive such bishops as lapsed into the Arian heresy, into any clerical station in the Church again? These were the principal and leading questions in the whole debate, and the rest only followed upon them: as, Whether the Arians, and all other heretics, were mere heathens? Whether, upon that supposition, the baptism of heretics was valid, and not rather to be repeated? Whether any but a Christian priest could administer Christian baptism? &c. Therefore the doctor is mistaken in saying, "The invalidity of lay-baptism was the main point in dispute;" which was no dispute at all, but only hypothetical. And he would have done well, instead of blaming me for not carefully reading and considering St. Jerome's Dialogue, or not exactly stating the dispute with the Luciferians, to have demonstrated to his reader, that he had been more careful and exactly judicious in reading it himself, by giving his reader a full and accurate account of the whole matter: which would have been of more use than his two other pretended demonstrations.

But there is one thing, though not very material to the cause, I must blame the doctor for by the way, which is, that he sometimes misrepresents me: as, here, he makes me say, "The Arian priests *only* were mere heathens;" whereas

Digitized by Google

the word "only" is thrust in from his own invention: for I had no intention to say, the dispute was about the priests *only*, or about the Arian heretics, exclusive of all others. Again he says (p. 66), "I make it *the main* point in controversy, whether the Arians were mere heathens: when indeed it was no more than a thing heedlessly asserted by the Luciferian, and what he yielded up immediately; and therefore the merits of the cause did not depend upon it." To which I must answer, that my words are here changed again, "a main point" for "one point," only to make them a point of dispute to no purpose; which kind of writing I desire my friend to forbear for the future.

But how does it appear that the merits of the cause, on the side of the Luciferian, noways depended upon that point? Why, the doctor says, he maintains his cause after he had entirely given that up. Which shews how negligent my friend was in considering the whole scope of St. Jerome's Dialogue, at the same time that he accuses me of want of care in reading it. For, first, this very point comes again in play, and is argued upon, *pro* and *con*, by the two disputants, in the fifth chapter of the Dialogue. The Luciferian pleads,[e] "That an Arian layman might be pardoned, because in the simplicity of his heart he took the Arian Church to be the Church of God, and so came thither to be baptized, believing in his own faith." To which the Orthodox replies, "You surprise me with strange news in asserting, that a man may be made a Christian by one who himself was no Christian." Does not this still go upon the Luciferian supposition, that the Arians were no Christians, but heathens? But, suppose again, this point had been entirely given up by Helladius; the doctor might have known that this Helladius, the Luciferian disputant, not only gives up this point, but all other points in dispute, by degrees, one after another, before he comes to the end of the Dialogue, as owning himself convicted and converted by his opponent. And will the doctor hence conclude, that

[e] Hieron. Dial. cont. Lucif. c. v. *Lucif.* Laico ideo ignoscendum est, quia ecclesiam Dei putans, simpliciter accessit, et juxta fidem suam credens baptizatus est. *Orthodor.* Novam rem asseris, ut Christianus quisquam factus sit ab eo qui non fuit Christianus. (Vallars. Venet. vol. ii. p. 183, at bottom.)

Digitized by Google

these were none of them points of dispute between the Catholics and Luciferians, because this single Luciferian happened to give them all up entirely upon his conviction? I believe if Dr. Brett should happen to give me up all the points in debate between us in this book, as he has done one or two already, his friends would hardly allow there were no points of dispute remaining, because of his concessions or conversion. And yet this is the way the doctor takes to make his reader believe I was plainly mistaken in stating the controversy between St. Jerome and the Luciferians.

But let us leave skirmishing, and come to that point which the doctor calls the merits of the cause, and upon this join issue with him. He says (p. 66), "That the public avowed doctrine and practice of the Luciferian sect, was to receive the Arians upon the renouncing their heresy by penance, and not by baptism; and receiving them all as laymen, none as clergymen: in which doctrine and practice they differed from the orthodox, who received the Arian laymen as laymen, and their clergy as clergy, according to the orders they had received during their heresy: so that an Arian bishop, if he came over to the Church, was still reputed a bishop; a priest, a priest; and a deacon, a deacon. Whereas if an Arian bishop, priest, or deacon, came over to the Luciferians, he was reputed to be but a mere layman."

The doctor calls this the right state of the matter, but he quotes no author for it: and he did well, for he had none for some parts of it, which are only his own imagination and invention, for want of an exact understanding of the discipline of the ancient Church. What he says of the Luciferians is true: they admitted no Arian bishops, priests, or deacons, but only in the quality of laymen: but then it is not true, that the Church always, on the other hand, admitted Arian bishops, priests, and deacons, to the same station they had before; and much less all other heretics and schismatics whatsoever. For she very frequently denied them this privilege, and by the strictness of her ordinary rules was obliged to do it: and therefore she very often reduced them entirely, by exact discipline, to mere lay-communion, and reputed them no other than laymen, neither before, while they con-

Digitized by Google

tinued in heresy, nor after their return to the Church; as the doctor will find it fully made out in the following discourse, and I doubt not to his content and satisfaction. This, therefore, could not be the dispute the Church had with the Luciferians. But this question was, Whether the Church was so tied to this rule of discipline in the exact rigour and strictness of it, as that she could not, for any prudential reason, or upon any extraordinary occasion, dispense therewith, so as to allow an Arian bishop or other heretic to become a bishop of the Catholic Church, without polluting her own communion? Lucifer said, "The Church had no such dispensing power to be exercised on any occasion." And, therefore, he broke communion with the Church, for receiving those three hundred bishops of the Council of Ariminum, whom he thought worthy of degradation, as Arian heretics. But the Church maintained her own liberty and power to dispense with this rule upon just and proper occasions: and, therefore, as in some cases she refused to receive Arians and other heretics among her clergy; so when in prudence and charity she found it requisite, she dispensed with her ordinary rule, and took them in at discretion. This aggrieved Lucifer, and that was the occasion of his schism: he was for rejecting all heretics; the Church was for rejecting or receiving them at discretion: he denied the Church's power absolutely in this matter; the Church maintained her own power and liberty to act in the affair, as prudential reasons and the exigencies of the Church should require and direct her. Therefore she did not receive Arian bishops, or any other heretical bishops, promiscuously, in the state they were in, as the doctor represents, but only as the exigency of affairs required: she sometimes dispensed with her rule, but more commonly reduced them to lay-communion; as the doctor might have learned from the canons of the Church, and even from St. Jerome himself in this Dialogue, if he had not, as usual, been too hasty in making his conclusions. For, as I have observed before, St. Jerome says, in the seventh chapter of this Dialogue, that in strictness of discipline none were allowed to be bishops in the Church, who had once been heretics. Therefore the admitting them was not a thing of course, or

Digitized by Google

necessity, or universal practice, but only done by way of dispensation with the ordinary rule, as a matter of grace and favour, or expediency, as prudence directed, upon proper occasions; of which the Church always made herself judge, and reserved to herself the liberty of acting this way or that way, as she thought most expedient; which Lucifer, in his stiffness and moroseness, would not allow. This was the true state of this matter, whatever the doctor has suggested to the contrary.

Now, then, let us see how St. Jerome argues with the Luciferian, in behalf of this liberty and power of the Church, and what advantage the doctor would fain make of his argumentation. "Tell me," says St. Jerome, "why you receive a layman coming over from the Arians, and do not receive a bishop?" The Luciferian answers, "I receive a layman, because he confesses that he has erred; and the Lord desireth the repentance, and not the death of a sinner." "And I," says the Orthodox Christian, "receive a bishop, because he confesses that he has erred; and the Lord desireth the repentance, and not the death of a sinner." The Luciferian answers, "If he confesses that he has erred, why does he continue a bishop? Let him depose himself from the priesthood, and I will grant pardon to the penitent." "I will answer you in your own words," says St. Jerome: "if a layman confesses that he has erred, why does he continue a laic? Let him depose himself from the priesthood of a layman, that is, his baptism; and I will grant pardon to the penitent: for it is written, 'He hath made us a kingdom and priests unto his Father.' And, again, 'A holy nation, a royal priesthood, a chosen people.' All that is lawful for a Christian, is common as well to a bishop as a layman. He that does penance, condemns his former acts. If it be not lawful for a penitent bishop to remain what he was, it is not lawful for a penitent layman to remain in that state for which he does penance. We do not act inconsistently with ourselves: either we receive the bishop with his people, whom he has made Christians; or, if we receive not the bishop, we know that we ought also to reject the people."

Upon this the doctor asks this question: "Do not those,

Digitized by Google

therefore, according to St. Jerome's principle, and the sense and practice of the Catholic Church in his time, act inconsistently with themselves, who are for receiving the dissenting laymen as lay-Christians, and their teachers also in the station of laymen; but will not receive those, who they suppose make them Christians by baptism, as clergymen? The Catholic Church, as he observes, did not receive any upon repentance without baptism, except they came over from a sect, whose clergy were also received as clergymen."

If the doctor had truly understood the discipline of the Primitive Church, he never would have asked such a question as this. And he might have spared his reflection, if for no other reason, yet for the sake of his mother, the Church of England; whose known and avowed practice, and not merely that of any private men, it manifestly reflects upon. But it is not a greater reflection on the Church of England, than it is on the practice of the whole Catholic Primitive Church, which, in receiving those who were baptized by heretics and schismatics, very often received those as laymen, whose teachers and baptizers she would not receive as clergymen, but only in the station of laymen; as I intend to give the doctor full proof from another sort of authorities than what he here insists upon. So that whatever pretended inconsistency there is in the thing, the charge lights as heavy upon the whole Primitive Church, as it does upon any others. And yet, after all, if I have any understanding of this difficult passage of St. Jerome (for I will not pretend here to be exact master of it), there is no ground to make such a reflection from his argumentation. For St. Jerome seems here to me not to speak absolutely and dogmatically either his own sense always, or the sense of the Church, but to be arguing hypothetically, and, as we now say, *ad hominem*, with his adversaries, upon their own principles and practice. It is plain enough he does so in some expressions; as where he says, "If a layman confesses that he has erred, why does he continue a laic? Let him depose himself from the priesthood of a layman, that is, his baptism, and I will grant pardon to the penitent." This was not according to the principles or practice of the Church:

Digitized by Google

for she never deposed laymen from their baptism, if once truly baptized by heretics. Nor does St. Jerome plead for it, but only shews his adversaries what they ought to do according to their own principles, who asserted, that all heretics were mere heathens; and therefore, according to their principles, laymen ought to be deposed from their priesthood, that is, their baptism, as well as clergymen from their priesthood; because, if heretics were mere heathens, they could have no pretence to Christian baptism. And, therefore, there was as much reason to allow the Church her liberty to receive clergymen to their priesthood, if she thought fit to do it, as the Luciferians took in receiving laymen to their priesthood, which was their baptism, even when their principles led them to depose them. Therefore he charges the Luciferians as acting inconsistently with themselves, and against their own principles; whilst the Church acted consistently to her own principles, which were to use her liberty in receiving clergymen to their orders, if she thought it requisite in her own wisdom and discretion. Not that the Church was bound to do this in all cases, or else reject the people with the priests, as the doctor pleads: neither of which he will ever be able to prove to have been the practice of the Church, either from St. Jerome or any other author. For, as I said before, it appears evidently in fact, that she often received laymen, without obliging them to receive a new baptism, at the same time that she rejected the priests, that had given them baptism, from their pretended priesthood. So that it seems pretty plain to me, that St. Jerome is here only arguing hypothetically with his adversaries; and if the doctor would have used this key, he might more happily have unlocked the dark sense and meaning of his author, and spared his unnecessary reflections.

But the doctor goes on again with St. Jerome (p. 69): "Wherefore I beseech you," says he, "that you either allow him a right to offer sacrifice, whose baptisms you approve, or reject his baptism, whom you esteem to be no priest." Again, says he, "I do not at present either blame the Arians or defend them: I keep to my point. A bishop is received by us for the same reason for which a layman is

Digitized by Google

received." Here the doctor, by a little art, drops two words at the end of the sentence, which should have been put in, to make the reader understand the drift of his author. It should have been, "received by you," meaning the Luciferians: for St. Jerome's words are, *recipitur a vobis;* whereas, as the doctor has cited them, any one would believe that St. Jerome had said, that a bishop was received by the Church for the same reason for which a layman was received by her; when, indeed, St. Jerome says quite otherwise: 'A bishop is received by us (Catholics) upon the same foot as a layman is received by you' (Luciferians).—*Eadem ratione a nobis episcopum recipi, qua laicus a vobis recipitur.* Which makes a wide difference in the matter, as I shall shew the doctor by and by.

But he goes on still with St. Jerome: "Therefore according to the custom of boys disputing together," says he, "what you shall say, I will say; what you shall affirm, I will affirm; what you shall deny, I will deny. An Arian baptizes, therefore he is a bishop: he does not baptize: do you deny him to be a lay-Christian, and I do not receive him for a priest. I will follow you whithersoever you go: we will both stick in the mire, or both get out of it." Here the words, *Tu refuta laicum, et ego non recipio sacerdotem,* should be rendered otherwise: 'Do you refuse to receive the layman, and then I will not receive the priest.'

A little after, the Luciferian argues thus: "A layman, though baptized out of the faith of the Church," so the doctor reads it, *Extra ecclesiæ fidem baptizatus,* which, in my books (of the Colen edition, 1816), is, *Extra ecclesiam fide baptizatus,* 'baptized in the faith,' though 'out of the Church,'[f] "is received as a penitent. But a bishop shall not do penance, because he is a priest; or, if he should do penance, he ceases to be a bishop. Therefore we rightly receive a layman to penance, and reject a bishop, if he will continue in his priesthood." St. Jerome replies, "Prove to me, that a layman coming over from the Arians has baptism, and I will not refuse to admit him to penance. But, if he is no Christian, if he had not a priest who could make

[f] Venet. Vallars. vol. ii. p. 185.

Digitized by Google

him a Christian; how shall a man do penance, who does not yet believe?" The Luciferian answers, "Do you think it just, that an Arian should be a bishop?" "You prove him to be a bishop," says St. Jerome, "because you receive him, whom he has baptized. In this you are to be blamed, that you separate from us, and yet agree with us both in the faith, and in the reception of the Arians. We receive a bishop from the Arians for the same reason, for which you receive one baptized by them. We agree in faith, we agree in receiving heretics: let us agree in communion." The Luciferian replies, "Behold, I lift up my hands: I yield; you have conquered me."

These are the doctor's long citations out of St. Jerome; instead of which, one short plain proposition, asserting the necessity of rebaptizing all that were baptized by laymen, in ordinary cases, as I had produced one for the lawfulness of laymen's baptizing in extraordinary cases, had been much more to his purpose. But he pretends not to find any such, or so much as point it out to his reader; but only makes these two general observations upon the whole. 1. "That I was to blame for saying, St. Jerome was silent in this matter." 2. "That St. Jerome has plainly enough shewn what was the sense of the Catholic Church in this point. And whatsoever might be his opinion of lay-baptism in cases of necessity, it is certain he was of opinion, and the Church with him, that lay-baptism, in ordinary cases, was wholly null and void; and that persons, so pretendedly baptized, were not to be received into the Church as penitent Christians, but as Gentiles by baptism. For it is evident from him, that if they were not baptized with episcopal baptism, they received no baptism at all."

As to his first observation, I think, with submission, I was so far from being to blame for saying St. Jerome was silent upon the matter, that I should rather have been to blame if I had said otherwise, unless I could have proved it more directly, plainly, and closely, than the doctor has done. It is an easy matter to make a flourish with dark reasonings and ambiguous words, as many men have done with the intricate part of this Dialogue of St. Jerome: and

Digitized by Google

it is not a very easy matter to make an ordinary reader understand him, though I tell him he speaks not his own sense many times, but only hypothetically, to his adversaries. Yet I hope the doctor understands what I mean. Some of the most plausible words the doctor has urged, are these: *Reprobes ejus baptisma, quem non existimas sacerdotem*, 'Reject his baptism, whom you esteem to be no priest.' But it seems very probable to me, that St. Jerome here is not delivering dogmatically his own opinion, much less the sense and practice of the Church, but only shewing the adversaries what they ought to do upon their own principles: as any one that reads the whole passage will easily perceive. The Luciferian had laboured in a long discourse to prove, that the Arian bishops ought not to be admitted as bishops in the Church, because they were the disciples of Antichrist, the enemies of Christ, blind guides, salt without savour, idolaters, sacrilegious; and abundance more. And he also concluded,[g] "That the Church, by admitting them, had, as it were, by a little leaven, corrupted her whole mass, whilst to-day she received the eucharist at the hands of him whom, the day before, she rejected as an idolater." To this St. Jerome replies, "Admit that what you say be true; let an Arian bishop be the enemy of Christ; let him be insipid salt, a lamp without fire, an eye without sight: all that you can gain by this is, that he who has no salt himself, cannot season others; that a blind man cannot illuminate others; nor he make others shine, whose own light is extinct, and his lamp gone out. But why, then, do you complain of the insipid seasoner, while you eat of the

[g] Hieron. Dial. cont. Lucif. c. ii. Ex quibus ostenditur (dicit *Luciferianus*), vos per modicum fermentum totam ecclesiæ massam corrupisse, et de ejus manu hodie eucharistiam accipere, quem heri quasi idololum despuebatis. *Resp. Orthodoxus.* Sit quippe, ut vis, Arianorum episcopus hostis Christi, sit infatuatum sal, sit lucerna sine igniculo, sit oculus sine pupilla: nempe eo pervenies, ut salire non possit, qui sal ipse non habeat, non illuminet cæcus, non accendat extinctus. Tu autem, cum conditum ab eo cibum devores, cur insulsum arguis conditorem? De igniculo ejus ecclesia tua lucet, et lucernam ejus (p. 177) criminaris extinctam? Oculos tibi præbet, et cæcus est? Quamobrem oro te, ut aut sacrificandi ei licentiam tribuas, cujus baptisma probas; aut reprobes ejus baptisma, quem non existimas sacerdotem. Neque enim fieri potest, ut qui in baptismate sanctus est, sit apud altare peccator. (Vallars. vol. ii. p. 176, D. 2.)

Digitized by Google

meat which he has seasoned? Your Church shines by the light of his fire; and do you still complain that his lamp is gone out? He gives eyes to you; and is he himself blind? Wherefore I beseech you, either allow him the liberty of offering at the altar, whose baptism you approve; or else refuse his baptism, whom you do not esteem to be a priest. For it cannot be, that he who is holy in the ministration of baptism, can be a sinner at the altar."

Who sees not now, that the plain drift and design of St. Jerome was to argue with and confute the Luciferians, upon their own principles; by shewing them, that if an Arian bishop was qualified to minister true baptism, which they themselves supposed,—for they received his baptism without repeating it,—then he was as well qualified to be a priest, which he explains by offering sacrifice at the altar: if he was qualified to baptize, he was qualified to offer sacrifice at the altar? And therefore, upon their principles, they were obliged either to refuse the baptism of an Arian bishop, which yet they accepted; or else to allow him liberty of sacrificing at the altar, which they utterly refused. Whatever St. Jerome's notions might be in themselves, here is nothing in all this that clearly discovers them to us: for his discourse is all hypothetical, and only *argumentum ad hominem*, upon the principles and avowed practices of his adversaries. He does not say, that none but a priest, that could offer sacrifice at the altar,—which is the notion of a priest here spoken of,—could baptize: for then neither deacons, in ordinary cases, nor laymen, in extraordinary cases of necessity, could have done it; for neither of these is allowed to offer sacrifice at the altar: and yet St. Jerome allows them both to minister baptism authoritatively in those respective cases: but his intention was only to shew his adversaries, that if they allowed an Arian bishop to baptize, they ought also to allow him to offer sacrifice at the altar, since a bishop or priest cannot be debarred of one of these offices, and allowed the other: either he has a right to both, or a right to neither: he cannot be holy and a priest at the font in baptism,—and at the same time unholy and no priest at the altar. This was rational discourse to a Luciferian,

Digitized by Google

upon his own hypothesis, when the question was concerning an Arian bishop, Whether he had not as much right to sacrifice as to baptize? He that allowed the one to a bishop, ought in reason to allow the other; or else, by parity of reason, equally to deny him both. But here is nothing positively asserted, but all upon supposition. He does not here either absolutely vindicate or condemn the Arian baptism: he does not say, an Arian bishop has a right to sacrifice at the altar, but only upon supposition that he had a right to baptize, then he could not be denied to have a right to sacrifice also. So that here is nothing absolutely and positively determined by St. Jerome, concerning the absolute necessity of a priest, in all cases, to minister baptism, unless we distinguish the priesthood, as St. Jerome does elsewhere, into the *sacerdotium clerici, et sacerdotium laici*, 'the priesthood of a clergyman, and the priesthood of a layman,' which is the Christian's baptism: in which latter and large notion it is necessary every man should be a priest, that is, a baptized Christian, that ministers Christian baptism: for though the Luciferian was forced to maintain it upon his absurd principles, yet St. Jerome and all the ancients utterly deny, that a man that was a mere heathen, could give Christian baptism: but I do not think that St. Jerome here, in this place, intended to determine who was the minister of baptism, but only to infer from the principle and concession of the Luciferians, that if an Arian bishop had power to baptize, then he had power to offer sacrifice at the altar also: and so the Church was vindicated in receiving Arian bishops again into office, even upon the principle of the Luciferians. He does not here determine, whether the Arians were true bishops and priests, or not; though he does elsewhere in the negative: nor whether the Church, in strictness of discipline, was obliged to receive them to the episcopal honour again; which in other places he also plainly denies:—but he only vindicates the Church's prudential liberty in receiving them, from the practice of the Luciferians, who, by the same reason that they allowed them to baptize, ought to allow them to sacrifice at the altar also.

Digitized by Google

I have been the longer in explaining this short passage of St. Jerome, because the right explication of it will help as a key to open the labyrinth of all the rest of his dark and intricate reasonings, which Dr. Brett has chosen to be the groundwork of his demonstration. This shews his meaning, when he says, "I do not at present either blame the Arians or defend them: I keep to my point: a bishop is received by us upon the same reason as a layman is received by you. What you shall affirm, I will affirm; what you shall deny, I will deny. An Arian baptizes; therefore he is a bishop: he does not baptize; do you refuse to receive the layman, and I will not receive the bishop." Is not this the point he still keeps to, to follow the Luciferians and argue with them upon their own principles? Here is nothing of St. Jerome's positive sense, or the Church's in all this, but only to catch the adversaries in all their windings and turnings, upon their own hypothesis. Otherwise St. Jerome would speak contradictions, that an Arian was a bishop, and not a bishop; that he could baptize, and not baptize; that the Church did both receive him, and not receive him.

So again, when he says, "Prove to me, that a layman coming over from the Arians has baptism, and I will not refuse to admit him to penance. But if he is not a Christian, if he had not a priest to make him a Christian, how shall a man do penance who does not yet believe?" St. Jerome does not here deny absolutely, that an Arian's baptism might be received,—for the Church actually received them,—but only upon the hypothesis of the Luciferians, who said, all Arians, as well their lay-priests as clergy-priests, were mere heathens; and consequently there were no priests of any kind among them that could give Christian baptism: for a man must be a Christian priest of some sort or other, and not a mere heathen, before he is qualified to give Christian baptism. So that his saying, "A man is no Christian, if he had not a priest to make him a Christian," makes nothing for the absolute invalidity of lay-baptism in general,—which St. Jerome himself plainly allows to laymen, or lay-priests, as he calls them, in case of necessity,—but

Digitized by Google

only upon the hypothesis of the Luciferians, who made all Arians no priests, but mere heathens.

In the last place, when the Luciferian demands, "Do you think it just that an Arian should be a bishop?" St. Jerome replies, "You prove him to be a bishop, because you receive him whom he has baptized." This answer is still made to the Luciferian upon his own practice. St. Jerome does not assert, that every man that baptizes, is a bishop; for then a presbyter and a deacon would be a bishop; and a layman would be a bishop, because he baptizes in cases of necessity: but he only says, If the Luciferians allowed an Arian bishop to baptize, their own very practice proved he might be allowed to exercise any other episcopal acts; and they had no reason to quarrel with the Church, as they did, for admitting Arian bishops to officiate in the Church again, when in prudence she thought it requisite so to do, since they themselves allowed them to exercise one episcopal act, viz. baptism, and that was sufficient to justify the Church in receiving them again to officiate at the altar; since no just reason could be assigned, why a bishop should be allowed to baptize, and not also be admitted, if the Church thought fit, to offer sacrifice at the altar.

I believe any reasonable man will now see the whole tendency of St. Jerome's discourse in all these passages, that it was not to determine the point of the invalidity of lay-baptism, but to justify the Church in her prudence and condescension towards the Arian bishops, upon the principles of the Luciferians, as I have explained it. And, therefore, I cannot yet think myself to blame for saying St. Jerome was silent in this matter, however Dr. Brett is of a different opinion.

But, admit St. Jerome had as clearly delivered his opinion against the validity of lay-baptism in ordinary cases, as the doctor imagines: yet it does not so certainly follow from hence, as to amount to a demonstration, that the whole Church must needs be of the same opinion: for might not St. Jerome mistake the sense and practice of the Church as well as another man? Or mistake her in this point as well as in some others? Might he not mistake the sense of the



Digitized by Google

Church then, as well as either Dr. Brett or I do now mistake the sense and practice of the Church of England, who deliver contrary opinions about her, and therefore one of us must needs be mistaken? If St. Jerome had never so plainly delivered this as the sense of the Church, yet if there be greater evidence from the Church herself, and such evidence as cannot be contradicted, that it was otherwise; then the testimony of the Church herself, and not St. Jerome, is to be believed in this case. And that thus it was, I will prove to the doctor by another sort of demonstration than that which he pretends to. For I will shew it plainly from the history of the six first general councils and many others, which in full consent with one another are the best evidence of the Church's sense and practice, that she received the baptism of those whom she accounted laymen. For all heretics and schismatics, when once convicted and degraded, were no other than laymen in her opinion. Which if I shew the doctor plainly to be true, then I hope he will submit to the force of the argument, which carries in it the evidence of a demonstration, since it is as good proof as the nature of the subject is capable of: and we shall need no longer dispute or cavil about St. Jerome or any other private author, when the question is once so fully decided by the supreme authority of the Church. This, therefore, is what I will try with the doctor, and the gentlemen of his opinion, in the following discourse.

SECT. VII. — *The Testimony of Chrysostom no Evidence against the Baptism of Laymen in extraordinary Cases.*

And here for the same reason I might have omitted what the doctor says of St. Chrysostom, p. 53, who is the only remaining author the doctor pretends to urge for his cause. I had said before, that Dr. Forbes had utterly mistaken the meaning of St. Chrysostom. For when Chrysostom confines the office of baptism to the hands of a priest, he only means in ordinary cases: otherwise deacons, who are no priests, would be absolutely excluded from it in all cases whatsoever, as well as laymen: and yet Chrysostom allows deacons to baptize in cases of necessity; which makes it

Digitized by Google

evident, that his discourse only relates to the ministration of baptism in ordinary cases.—To which the doctor replies, that St. Chrysostom here by a priest means only a bishop. Which, in my opinion, instead of mending the matter, makes it so much worse. For then, according to Dr. Forbes's interpretation, no valid baptism could be administered but by the hands of a bishop. Yet, Dr. Brett says, by the bishop's authority presbyters and deacons may do it. But I conceive there is some difference between the bishop's hands and his authority: and so Dr. Forbes thought, who makes this passage conclude as much against deacons as laymen; and that with reason enough, upon his supposition, that none but a priest, with his own hands actually, can have authority to baptize in any case whatsoever. For the hands of a deacon were not the hands of a priest, either in the opinion of Chrysostom or Dr. Forbes, whether we understand by a priest either the bishop alone, or a bishop and presbyter together. So that this passage, in the sense which Dr. Forbes puts upon it, holds as much against deacons as laymen. And Dr. Brett, instead of vindicating Dr. Forbes, runs to another thing, and tells us, deacons may have authority from the bishop to baptize; which Dr. Forbes utterly denies. So these gentlemen clash together, and yet neither of them hit the truth; because they would not rightly understand Chrysostom of ministering baptism in ordinary cases only, which I shewed was all that possibly could be his meaning.

But Dr. Brett says, "Chrysostom's opinion is plainly so far on their side, as to shew the invalidity of all anti-episcopal baptisms, all baptisms by such as are uncommissioned, unauthorized by a bishop." To which I answer, though all such baptisms should be allowed to be invalid, yet this is more than the doctor can prove out of this place of Chrysostom, unless mere silence be a proof. For Chrysostom says nothing here expressly of commissioned or uncommissioned, authorized or unauthorized, episcopal or anti-episcopal, baptism; but only that baptism cannot be given by any but the hands of a priest; which I interpret of the ordinary ministration by a bishop or a presbyter; but Dr. Forbes extends it to all cases, not only ordinary but extraordinary, and

Digitized by Google

thereby excludes deacons from the power of baptizing, as well as laymen. Dr. Brett confines the office of baptism to the hands of a bishop, but says he may commission a presbyter or a deacon, yet not a layman: which is only telling a man's own sense without his author; for Chrysostom's words make no such distinctions here: and the doctor should have proved his sense of this place, as I did, from others in the same author, if he had intended to satisfy a judicious reader.

But the doctor goes a little further, and says, "Chrysostom does not give his own private opinion, but the known judgment and practice of the Church." Yet the reader must take this upon his word too: for he offers no manner of proof of it, but only by saying, the Church had confined this charge to the episcopal office; and that, he thinks, invalidated all such baptisms as had not the bishop's commission. Now this is the thing to be tried between the doctor and me, Whether all unauthorized and uncommissioned baptism, that was administered by persons that were no actual priests, but laymen, was declared wholly invalid, null, and void, and, as such, ordered to be repeated by the Church? The doctor affirms it upon the testimony of St. Cyprian, St. Basil, St. Jerome, and St. Chrysostom, which I have now examined: and I deny it upon the strongest evidence of all the general and particular councils of the Church, whose decrees and orders must be owned to be the most convincing proof of the Church's sense and practice. From which I shall shew, that the Church received the baptism of some heretics and schismatics, who never had any true orders from any episcopal ordination; and the baptism of others, whom she herself degraded, and took their orders from them, leaving them altogether in an unauthorized state, and divested of all sacerdotal power; not having so much as the name, much less the dignity and authority, of priests, but entirely reduced to the state and quality of laymen. If I can prove these things to my friend in a way of the plainest demonstration to his satisfaction, I hope I shall have no further dispute with him, whatever I may have with others, upon this subject; because I know him to be an

Digitized by Google

ingenuous man, and he has promised to yield the cause upon fair and rational conviction. And here I will do him that justice to say, he has managed the dispute with as much strength and learning as the cause would bear, and with as much good manners and Christian temper as any disputant in the present age: for which he is truly to be commended, and will not fail thereby to advance his reputation with those, who cannot otherwise fall in with his mistaken notions, which happen to run so cross to the general sense and practice of the Catholic Church.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

A

# SCHOLASTICAL HISTORY,

*&c. &c.*

## PART II.

---

### CHAPTER I.

THAT HERETICS, AND SCHISMATICS, AND DEGRADED CLERKS, AND EXCOMMUNICATED CLERKS, WHEN ONCE THEY ARE CONVICTED AND LEGALLY CENSURED, ARE NO LONGER AUTHORIZED TO MINISTER BAPTISM, OR OFFICIATE AS TRUE PRIESTS AND MINISTERS OF GOD AND THE CHURCH; BUT THAT HENCEFORTH ALL THEIR ACTS ARE UNAUTHORIZED, AND DONE ONLY BY USURPATION.—THIS PROVED FROM THE HISTORY OF THE SIX FIRST GENERAL COUNCILS, AND THEIR PROCEEDINGS AGAINST HERETICS, AND SCHISMATICS, AND OTHER DELINQUENTS.

SECT. I.—*How Meletius was deposed and divested of all Ministerial Authority, by the Council of Nice.*

THE first general council was the famous Council of Nice, which all men reverence, and which alone were sufficient to put an end to this whole dispute. This Council was called by Constantine in the year 325, to allay the flames that had some time before been raised by Meletius[a] and Arius in the Church. Meletius was bishop of Lycopolis, in Egypt, who had for a long time headed a schism of his own making, against the bishops of Alexandria, his lawful metropolitans. The occasion of his schism was this: Meletius, in the time of the

[a] Μελ-ί-τιος: *Socrates.*

Digitized by Google

Dioclesian persecution, had denied the faith, and offered sacrifice to idols; for which, and some other reasons, he was according to the laws of the Church, deposed by Peter, bishop of Alexandria, who presently after suffered martyrdom. Meletius,[b] instead of submitting to this legal censure, raised a schism upon it, first against Peter, and then against Achillas and Alexander, his successors; ordaining bishops and priests throughout Egypt and Thebais, to strengthen his faction; and this he continued to do, till the time of the Council of Nice. The Council, therefore, to correct this presumption, and confirm the sentence, which before had been passed upon him, made this peremptory decree against him, which is in their Synodical Epistle, sent to the Churches of Alexandria, Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, and recorded by Socrates and Theodoret,[c] "That Meletius should have no manner of power or authority, either of ordaining or making elections; that he should be confined to his own city, and neither appear in the country, nor in any other city upon such an occasion, but only retain the bare name and title of his dignity. And for such bishops and presbyters as had been ordained by him, they should not be admitted to officiate as ministers in the Catholic Church, till they were μυστικωτέρᾳ χειροτονίᾳ βεβαιωθέντες, 'confirmed or authorized by a more

[b] Socrat. Hist. lib. i. c. vi. (Vales. 1700, p. 12, D. 6.) Τοῦ Πέτρου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Ἀλεξανδρείας, τοῦ ἐπὶ Διοκλητιανοῦ μαρτυρήσαντος, Μελίτιός τις μιᾶς τῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ πόλεων ἐπίσκοπος καθηρέθη δι' ἄλλας τε πολλὰς αἰτίας, καὶ μάλιστα ὅτι ἐν τῷ διωγμῷ ἀρνησάμενος τὴν πίστιν, ἐπίθυσεν. οὗτος καθαιρεθεὶς πολλούς τε ἰσχνῶς τοὺς ἐπομένους αὐτῷ, αἱρεσιάρχης κατέστη τῶν ἄχρι νῦν ἐξ αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον Μελιτιανῶν καλουμένων.——Athanas. Apol. p. 777, B. 5, (p. 177, edit. Paris. 1698.) Πέτρος παρ' ἡμῖν, πρὸ μὲν τοῦ διωγμοῦ, γέγονεν ἐπίσκοπος, ἐν δὲ τῷ διωγμῷ καὶ μαρτύρησεν. Οὗτος Μελίτιον ἀπὸ τῆς Αἰγύπτου λεγόμενον ἐπίσκοπον, ἐπὶ πολλαῖς ἐλεγχθέντα παρανομίαις καὶ θυσίᾳ, ἐν κοινῇ συνόδῳ τῶν ἐπισκόπων, καθεῖλεν. Ἀλλὰ Μελίτιος οὐ πρὸς ἑτέραν σύνοδον κατέφυγεν, οὐδὲ ἐσπούδασεν ἀπολογήσασθαι τοῖς μετὰ ταῦτα, σχίσμα δὲ ἐποίησε.

[c] Socrat. lib. i. c. ix. (p. 24, B. 3.) Ἔδοξεν Μελίτιον μὲν . . . μένειν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ μηδεμίαν ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν αὐτὸν μήτε χειροθετεῖν, μήτε προχειρίζεσθαι, μήτε ἐν χώρᾳ, μήτε ἐν πόλει ἑτέρᾳ φαίνεσθαι, ταύτης τῆς προφάσεως ἕνεκα· ψιλὸν δὲ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς τιμῆς κεκτῆσθαι· τοὺς δὲ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κατασταθέντας, μυστικωτέρᾳ χειροτονίᾳ βεβαιωθέντας κοινωνῆσαι ἐπὶ τούτοις, ἐφ' ᾧτε ἔχειν μὲν αὐτοὺς τὴν τιμὴν καὶ λειτουργίαν, δευτέρους δὲ εἶναι ἐξάπαντος πάντων τῶν ἐν ἑκάστῃ παροικίᾳ τε καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐξεταζομένων, τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ τιμιωτάτου καὶ συλλειτουργοῦ ἡμῶν Ἀλεξάνδρου προκεχειρισμένων. —— Theodoret. lib. i. c. ix.

Digitized by Google

sacred imposition of hands,' together with the approbation and allowance of the bishop of Alexandria." Which Valesius, and Du Pin, and other learned men, take to imply a new ordination: however, it certainly implies a new authority and confirmation from the Church; and supposes that all their pretended ministerial offices before were done without competent and just authority, and only by mere usurpation: and if they continued to act as they had done before, all their ministerial acts would be unauthorized, especially after such a formal and judicial degradation by the greatest power of the Church in a general council. This, I think, is as clear as the sun at noon-day, that either the Council of Nice had no authority from God, by the power of the keys, to deprive Meletius of his authority, for his contumacy and just deserts; or else, that Meletius had no authority, after this, to act as a bishop of the Church; nor any of his accomplices, who only derived from him any authority to perform any ministerial offices, till they had first received a more competent authority from the Catholic Church. And yet the Council made no decree that the baptisms of all these should be annulled, and that such as came over from them, should be rebaptized again; as she did in the case of the Paulianists, in her 19th canon: because, though the Meletians and Paulianists were equally divested of the Church's true authority to minister baptism or any other sacred office, yet the one baptized in the form of the Church, and the other did not; which was the reason of this distinction. And it plainly shews the sense of the Nicene fathers, that they did not think a baptism, that was given in due form, was necessarily to be repeated, because given by a person who had no competent authority to give it: for then they would have ordered the Meletians to have been rebaptized, as well as the Paulianists: which yet neither they nor any other council have done; nor is there to be found any instance of such a Meletian's rebaptization, that I know of, in all ancient history.

After this decree, Meletius, as soon as he came back to Lycopolis, went on in his own way, in contempt of the Council, ordaining bishops to propagate his schism, as he

Digitized by Google

had done before. For, as Baronius observes out of Athanasius,[d] he made Arsenius, bishop of Hypsela, in Thebais: and Sozomen adds,[e] "That a little before his death, he ordained one John to be his successor at Lycopolis." Now, will any one say, that Meletius had authority to ordain these men, when the Council had taken all power and authority from him? If not, then Meletius was no true priest or minister of God and his Church; but all his acts were unauthorized, and done only by usurpation.

## SECT. II.—*How Arius was deposed and anathematized by the same Council.*

The same Council shewed her authority a little further in the condemnation of Arius, and those bishops that joined with him in his heresy: for they not only deposed them, but anathematized them also. Arius himself had been once or twice deposed before by Alexander, his bishop, and declared excommunicate or anathematized in a full synod of Egyptian bishops. Socrates says,[f] "Alexander called a synod of many bishops, where Arius, and those that embraced his opinions, were deposed: and Alexander wrote a synodical or encyclical epistle, to give notice to all other Churches." This epistle is recorded by Socrates, wherein it is said, "That they were cast out of the Church, and anathematized, and declared to be aliens both from the Church and the Catholic faith." And Alexander says, "He therefore intimated the

[d] Athanas. Apol. ii. (p. 185, Paris.) Ἀρσένιος ἐπίσκοπος τῶν ποτε ὑπὸ Μελίτιον τῆς Τψηλιτῶν πόλεως, κ. τ. λ.——Baron. ad an. 326, n. vii. Ordinavit pariter Meletius contra decreta Nicæna Arsenium episcopum Hypselitarum, quibus ipse Meletius (ut ait Athanasius, Apol. ii.) aliquando præfuit. (Antuerp. 1598, vol. iii. p. 343.)

[e] Sozomen. lib. ii. c. xxi. (Vales. 1700, p. 384, B. 7.) Μικρὸν οὐ πολὺ δὲ μέλλων τὸν βίον καταλιμπάνειν, Ἰωάννην τινὰ τῶν αὐτῶν συνήθων . . . καθίστησιν ἀντ' αὐτοῦ.

[f] Socrat. lib. i. c. vi. (p. 9, A. 9.) Ἀλέξανδρος συνέδριον πολλῶν ἐπισκόπων καθίσας, τὸν μὲν Ἄρειον καὶ τοὺς ἀποδεχομένους τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ καθαιρεῖ. Γράφει δὲ τοῖς κατὰ πόλιν, τοιάδε, κ. τ. λ. . (p. 11, C. 5.) Διὸ καὶ ἀπεπηρύχθησαν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ ἀνεθεματίσθησαν. . . . ἀποδιίξαντες αὐτοὺς ἀλλοτρίους τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τε καὶ πίστεως. . (p. 12, A. 7.) Πρέπει γὰρ ἡμᾶς ὡς Χριστιανοὺς ὄντας, πάντας τοὺς κατὰ Χριστοῦ λίγοντάς τι καὶ φρονοῦντας, ὡς θεομάχους καὶ φθορέας τῶν ψυχῶν ἀποστρέφεσθαι, καὶ μηδὲ κἂν χαίρειν τοῖς τοιούτοις λέγειν· ἵνα μή ποτε καὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις αὐτῶν κοινωνοὶ γινώμεθα, ὡς παρήγγειλεν ὁ μακάριος Ἰωάννης.

Digitized by Google

fact to other Churches, that they might do as became Christians, that is, shew their aversion to all such as spake against Christ, or held ill opinions of him, as men that were enemies to God, and destroyers of men's souls; and that they might not bid them, God speed, and so become partakers in their sins, as St. John words it." Epiphanius takes notice of the same, and says,[g] Alexander expelled Arius from the Church, and published his excommunication throughout the whole city. And the curious diligence of Cotelerius has helped us to the very form of his deposition, under the name of Καθαίρεσις Ἀρείου, 'The Deposition of Arius,' which the inquisitive reader may find at large in Cotelerius's Notes upon the Constitutions.[h] Now, what Alexander and the Egyptian synods had done before, the great Council of Nice confirmed and ratified, declaring Arius, and two bishops, Secundus and Theonas, to be deposed for joining with him:[i] and they also anathematized, or laid the greater excommunication upon him, and all others that should maintain the same errors; adding these words at the end of their creed,[j] "Those that say, there was a time when the

[g] Epiphan. Hæres. lxix. n. iii. Ἐξεσῖ αὐτὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ ἀκκηρυκτὸν ποιεῖ ἐν τῇ πόλει. (Colon. 1682, vol. i. p. 729.)

[h] Coteler. Not. in Constitut. Apost. lib. viii. c. xxviii. (In gratiam eorum qui hanc depositionem legere volent, Cotelerium autem ipsum evolvere non possunt, lubet eam, etsi longiorem, heic interponere.—Grischow.) Καθαίρεσις Ἀρείου καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ, ὑπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἀλεξανδρείας. Ἀλέξανδρος πρεσβυτέροις καὶ διακόνοις Ἀλεξανδρείας καὶ Μαρεώτου παροῦσιν, ἀγαπητοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἐν Κυρίῳ χαίρειν. Εἰ καὶ φθάσαντες ὑπεγράψατε, οἷς ἐπέστειλα τοῖς περὶ Ἄρειον πρεσβύταις αὐτοῖς (αὐτοὺς) ἀρνήσασθαι μὲν τὴν ἀσέβειαν, πεισθῆναι δὲ τῇ ὑγιαινούσῃ καὶ καθολικῇ πίστει, καὶ ἰδίᾳ τε ἑαυτῶν ὀρθὴν τὴν προαίρεσιν, καὶ τὴν ἐν τοῖς δόγμασι συμφωνίαν τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, ὅμως ἐπειδὴ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἀπανταχοῦ συλλειτουργοὺς ἐπέστειλα περὶ τῶν περὶ Ἄρειον, ἀναγκαῖον ἡγησάμην, ὑμᾶς μὲν τοὺς τῆς πόλεως κληρικοὺς συναγαγεῖν, ὑμᾶς δὲ τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ Μαρεώτου μεταπέμψασθαι, μάλιστα ὅτι καὶ ἀφ' ὑμῶν Χάρης καὶ Πιστὸς πρεσβύτερος, καὶ Σαραπίων, καὶ Παράμμων, καὶ Ζώσιμος, καὶ Εἰρηναῖος διάκονοι, ἐπηκολούθησαν τοῖς περὶ Ἄρειον, καὶ ἠγάπησαν σὺν αὐτοῖς καθαιρεθέντας· ἵνα καὶ τὰ νῦν γραφόμενα γνῶτε, τίνες ἐν τούτοις συμφωνίαν ἑαυτῶν ἐπιδείξησθε, καὶ τῇ καθαιρέσει τῶν περὶ Ἄρειον καὶ τῶν περὶ Πιστὸν σύμψηφοι γένησθε. Πρέπει γὰρ τὰ παρ' ἐμοῦ γραφόμενα γινώσκειν ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἕκαστον ὡς παρ' αὐτοῦ γραφόμενα, ἐν τῇ παρεδρίᾳ κατέχειν.

[i] Conc. Nicæn. Epist. Synod. apud Socrat. lib. i. c. ix. (Vales. 1700, p. 24, A. 3.) Τοσοῦτον δὲ ἴσχυσε αὐτοῦ ἡ ἀσέβεια, ὡς καὶ παραπολέσαι Θεωνᾶν ἀπὸ Μαρμαρικῆς, καὶ Σεκοῦνδον ἀπὸ Πτολεμαΐδος· τῶν γὰρ αὐτῶν κἀκείνοι τετυχήκασιν.

[j] Apud Socrat. lib. i. c. viii. (p. 19, D. 4.) Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας, ὅτι ἦν ποτὲ, ὅτε

Digitized by Google

Son of God was not, or that he had no being before he was created, or that he was made out of nothing, or of any other substance, or created, or changeable, the Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematizes them."

Now, by the tenour of these direful censures, Arius, and all his adherents, were not only deposed from their clerical office and orders, but also expelled from lay-communion, and all the privileges of Christians, save only that their baptism entitled them to be admitted again into the Church upon a true repentance. But, in the meantime, they were neither authorized priests, nor complete lay-Christians, whilst they were under such bonds of excommunication. For no man is a complete layman, who is not in full communion with the Church. Upon this account, catechumens who are unbaptized, and heretics, and schismatics, and excommunicate persons, are but imperfect Christians: the first of these communicate with the Church in the faith, but not in the sacraments; the other three either excommunicate themselves, or are excommunicated by the power of the keys and Church censures. Till, therefore, they are admitted again, and loosed by the same power of the keys, they are not in full communion with the Church, and consequently but imperfect Christians. Now it would be absurd to say, that those who are not so much as proper and perfect lay-Christians, are proper and perfect priests; that they who have no right to receive themselves the sacraments, have authority to give the sacraments to others. Therefore, heretics, and schismatics, and priests under anathema, can have no authority to minister the sacraments whilst they are in that state: or, if they do, it is all done without authority and by usurpation. And this was the case of Arius, and all his adherents, whilst they were under the anathema of the Council of Nice. The baptisms, which they gave in that state, were given without authority, and were not so much as the baptisms of perfect lay-Christians. And yet the Church did not rebaptize such persons as were baptized in due form by them, but only

οὐκ ἦν, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, καὶ ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι, ἢ κτιστὸν, ἢ τρεπτὸν, ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀναθεματίζει ἡ ἁγία καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία.

Digitized by Google

supplied what was deficient in their baptism, at their return to the Church, by imposition of hands and confirmation; as I have fully proved in the first part of this History, which no one has pretended to call in question. This, then, I think, is demonstration, that if the Council of Nice took away all clerical authority from the Meletians and Arians; and left the one in a state of a layman, and the other not so much as laymen; and yet received the baptisms that were given by both these without rebaptizing;—she must receive the baptism of those who, in her opinion, had no authority to give baptism, because she herself had taken that authority from them. This one thing were enough to silence all disputes, if men will hearken to reason, or the authority of the Church in so great a Council. But let us see whether the Council of Nice was singular in this treatment of the Arians and Meletians; or whether the Church did not always follow her example in her behaviour toward heretics in succeeding ages.

SECT. III.—*How the Macedonians, Apollinarians, and other Heretics, were degraded and anathematized in the Second General Council of Constantinople.*

The next general council was that at Constantinople (an. 381), called by Theodosius the Great, where one hundred and fifty Oriental bishops met to condemn and exterminate two growing heresies: that of the Apollinarians, who denied the humanity of our Saviour, in denying the existence of his human soul; and the other, of the Macedonians, who denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost. Apollinarius, and his disciple, Timotheus, had some time before been condemned and degraded, in two famous councils of the East and West: the one at Rome, of ninety-three bishops, under Pope Damasus (an. 373 or 378); and the other at Antioch, of one hundred and forty-six bishops (an. 378 or 380). The Council at Rome both deposed and anathematized them,[k] as the Acts of the Council and Pope Damasus's Synodical

[k] Conc. Rom. Profess. Fidei, Conc. Labbé, ii. p. 900, D. 5. Anathematizamus eos qui pro hominis anima rationali et intelligibili, dicunt Dei Verbum in humana carne versatum, &c.

Digitized by Google

Epistle shew.[l] "We anathematize those," says the Council, "who say, that the word of God was instead of the rational and intelligent soul in the human flesh of Christ." "And," says Damasus, "we have deposed Timotheus, the profane scholar of Apollinarius, together with his impious doctrine." And so Theodoret understood the censure of the Council to be both deposition and excommunication.[m] This sentence was first confirmed in the Council of Antioch, and then in the general Council of Constantinople; in whose Synodical Epistle, recorded by Theodoret, it is said,[n] "That they had published a writing against the new sects, the Eunomians, the Arians, the Macedonians, and the Apollinarians, laying them all under the sentence of anathema." And one of the canons of that Council also confirms all that Damasus and the Council of Antioch had before decreed against the Macedonians, in these words:[o] "We approve the tome of the Western bishops, and those of Antioch, professing that there is but one Godhead of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." As, therefore, the Western bishops, and those of Antioch, had anathematized the Macedonians, so here the Council of Constantinople gave their approbation of the sentence. And in another canon,[p] they depose Maximus the cynic, who had intruded himself into the place of Gregory Nazianzen, at

[l] Damas. Epist. Synod. apud Theodoret. lib. v. c. x. (Vales. 1695, p. 212, D. 8.) Γινώσκετε, ὅτι τὸν πάλαι Τιμόθεον τὸν βέβηλον, τὸν μαθητὴν τοῦ Ἀπολλιναρίου τοῦ αἱρετικοῦ μετὰ τοῦ ἀσεβοῦς αὐτοῦ δόγματος καθείλομεν.

[m] Theodoret. lib. v. c. ix. (Vales. 1695, p. 212, C.) Καὶ Δάμασος δὲ ὁ πανεύφημος, ταύτην μαθὼν ἀναφυῆσαν τὴν αἵρεσιν, οὐκ Ἀπολλινάριον μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ Τιμόθεον τὸν ἐκείνουγε φοιτητὴν καθεῖλεν ἀσεβήσαντα· καὶ τοῦτο τοῖς τὴν ἰσην ἐβύνουσιν ἐπισκόποις, διὰ γραμμάτων διδήλωκεν.

[n] Ibid. lib. v. c. ix. (ibid. p. 212, B. 4.) Ταῦτα κατά τε τῆς Ἀρείου, καὶ Αἰτίου, καὶ Εὐνομίου μανίας· καὶ μέντοι καὶ κατὰ Σαβελλίου, καὶ Φωτεινοῦ, καὶ Μαρκέλλου, Παύλου τε τοῦ Σαμοσατέως, καὶ Μακεδονίου γεγράφασιν· ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἀπολλιναρίου καινοτομίαν προφανῶς ἀπεκήρυξαν, κ. τ. λ.

[o] Conc. Constantin. c. v. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 947.) Περὶ τοῦ τόμου τῶν δυτικῶν· καὶ τοὺς ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ ἀποδεξάμενα, τοὺς μίαν ὁμολογοῦντας τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ Υἱοῦ, καὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματος θεότητα.

[p] Ibid. c. iv. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 947.) Περὶ Μαξίμου τοῦ Κυνικοῦ, καὶ τῆς κατ' αὐτὸν ἀταξίας τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει γινομένης, ὥστε μήτε τὸν Μάξιμον ἐπίσκοπον ἢ γενέσθαι ἢ εἶναι, μήτε τοὺς παρ' αὐτοῦ χειροτονηθέντας ἐν οἱῳδήποτε βαθμῷ κλήρου, πάντων καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν καὶ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῦ γενομένων ἀκυρωθέντων.

Digitized by Google

Constantinople, by the help of seven bishops that ordained him, declaring, "That Maximus neither ever was a bishop, nor should be a bishop; nor any of those true clerks, that were ordained by him, in any degree whatsoever; all that had been done either to him, or by him, being actually void and null." There were two reasons for deposing this man: one was, that he had intruded himself into a full see, which, as I shall shew hereafter, always by the ancient canons made an ordination void. Another reason was, that he was an Apollinarian heretic, which is the reason that Theodoret assigns why the Council deposed him.[q] Now, then, the question will be, Whether any of these men, Maximus or his clergy, or the rest of the Macedonian and Apollinarian heretics, had any authority to minister baptism, after they were legally deposed by this general Council? To say they had authority still, notwithstanding their deposition, is only to affront the authority of the Council, and make a jest of all ecclesiastical censures. But if they had no authority to minister baptism, whether or no might the baptisms given by them, without authority, be received by the Church, supplying only what was deficient, without rebaptization? We need not go far for the resolution of this question: for this very Council has fully determined it in her seventh canon, if we allow that to belong to this Council: for there the Macedonians and Apollinarians are expressly named among other heretics, whose baptism might be received by the sacred unction without rebaptizing. Or, if any one questions the authority of that canon, as Bishop Beveridge does, yet the thing is evident from other proofs: for the Council of Trullo has the same canon;[r] and it does not appear that either the Macedonians or Apollinarians rejected

[q] Theodoret. lib. v. c. viii. (p. 207, D. 1.) Τὸν δὲ Μάξιμον, ὡς τῆς Ἀπολλιναρίου φρενοβλαβείας μετειληχότα, τῆς ἀρχιερατικῆς ἀξίας γυμνώσαντες ἀπεκήρυξαν.

[r] Conc. Trull. c. xcv. (Labbé, vol. vi. p. 1182, D.) Ἀρειανοὺς μὲν καὶ Μακεδονιανοὺς . . . καὶ Ἀπολλιναριστὰς δεχόμεθα διδόντας λιβέλλους, καὶ ἀναθεματίζοντας πᾶσαν αἵρεσιν, μὴ φρονοῦσαν ὡς φρονεῖ ἡ ἁγία τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία, σφραγιζομένους ἤτοι χριομένους πρῶτον τῷ ἁγίῳ μύρῳ τὸ μέτωπον, καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, καὶ τὰς ῥῖνας, καὶ τὸ στόμα, καὶ τὰ ὦτα, καὶ σφραγίζοντες αὐτοὺς λέγομεν· Σφραγὶς δωρεᾶς Πνεύματος ἁγίου.

Digitized by Google

the true form of baptism, but always baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. And it is observable, that this very Council, which annulled the ordination of Maximus, and all that were ordained by him, does not annul the baptisms given by them, or order them to be repeated: which shews that a difference was made between these things in the discipline and practice of the Church.

### SECT. IV. — *How the Third General Council of Ephesus degraded Nestorius and his Followers.*

The third general council was held at Ephesus, under Theodosius Junior (an. 431), by two hundred bishops and upwards, Cyril of Alexandria presiding over them. This Council is famous for the deposition of Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, and John, bishop of Antioch, and many others with them. And the forms of their depositions, both in the acts and canons of that Council, run in such a strain, as shew that they had a just sense of their own authority to degrade men for heresy, or any other great crimes; and that men so legally degraded had thenceforth no authority to perform any ministerial acts, unless the same power, which laid them under bonds, thought fit to grant them a legal relaxation. The sentence of deposition against Nestorius runs expressly in this form:[s] "Our Lord Jesus Christ, whom he hath blasphemed, doth, by this holy synod, declare Nestorius deprived of episcopal dignity, and all communion and society of the priesthood." Can any thing be more authentic or formal than this proceeding in the name of Christ? And were it reasonable to think the Council esteemed Nestorius a priest after such a judicial sentence as this? But they not only deposed Nestorius, but all his abettors and defenders, particularly Charisius, who made an Exposition upon the Creed, to wire-draw it to the sense of Nestorius. Against which they made that famous decree concerning new forms of faith: "That no one should offer,

[s] Conc. Ephes. act. i. Labbé, Conc. tom. iii. p. 534. Ὁ βλασφημηθεὶς παρ' αὐτοῦ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὥρισε διὰ τῆς παρούσης ἁγιωτάτης συνόδου, ἀλλότριον εἶναι τὸν αὐτὸν Νεστόριον τοῦ ἱερατικοῦ ἀξιώματος, καὶ παντὸς συλλόγου ἱερατικοῦ.

Digitized by Google

write, or compose any other creed for the use of new converts, besides that which was made in the Nicene Council: and if any transgressed this order, being bishops,[t] they declare them degraded from their episcopal order, and other clerks from their clerical order, and laymen to be anathematized." In like manner,[u] "If any bishops, clerks, or laymen, were found to believe or teach, concerning the incarnation of the Son of God, according to the exposition of Charisius, or the wicked and perverse doctrines of Nestorius, they should be liable to the same censure of this holy and œcumenical synod, viz. that a bishop should be removed from his episcopal office, and be deposed; and a clerk fall from his clerical degree; and a layman be anathematized, according to the tenour aforesaid." Now that by deposing of heretics they meant depriving them of all power and authority of the priesthood, they themselves tell us, who are best able to interpret their own meaning. For in their Synodical Epistle to Pope Cælestin,[w] where they give him an account of their proceedings against John, bishop of Antioch, and his schismatical synod, they tell him, "They had taken from them all power of the priesthood, so that they could now do no one any harm by their sentence of excommunication:" for it was but necessary and reasonable they

[t] Conc. Ephes. act. vi. (Labbé, vol. iii. p. 689.) Ὥρισεν ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος, ἑτέραν πίστιν μηδενὶ ἐξεῖναι προσφέρειν, ἤγουν συγγράφειν, ἢ συντιθέναι παρὰ τὴν ὁρισθεῖσαν παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων τῶν ἐν τῇ Νικαέων συνελθόντων σὺν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι τοὺς δὲ τολμῶντας ἢ συντιθέναι πίστιν ἑτέραν, ἤγουν προκομίζειν, ἢ προσφέρειν τοῖς ἐθέλουσιν ἐπιστρέφειν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας, ἢ ἐξ Ἑλληνισμοῦ, ἢ ἐξ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ, ἢ ἐξ αἱρέσεως οἱασδηποτοῦν. Τούτους, εἰ μὲν εἶεν ἐπίσκοποι ἢ κληρικοί, ἀλλοτρίους εἶναι τοὺς ἐπισκόπους τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, καὶ τοὺς κληρικοὺς τοῦ κλήρου. Εἰ δὲ λαϊκοί εἶεν, ἀναθεματίζεσθαι.

[u] Ibid. (p. 689, B. 1.) Κατὰ τὸν ἴσον δὲ τρόπον, εἰ φωραθείη τινες, εἴτε ἐπίσκοποι, εἴτε κληρικοί, φρονοῦντες ἢ διδάσκοντες τὰ ἐν τῇ προσκομισθείσῃ ἐκθέσει παρὰ Χαρισίου πρεσβυτέρου περὶ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως τοῦ μονογενοῦς Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἤγουν τὰ μιαρὰ καὶ διεστραμμένα Νεστορίου δόγματα, ἃ καὶ ὑποτέτακται, ὑποκείσθωσαν τῇ ἀποφάσει τῆς ἁγίας ταύτης καὶ οἰκουμενικῆς συνόδου· ὥστε δηλονότι τὸν μὲν ἐπίσκοπον ἀλλοτριοῦσθαι τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, καὶ εἶναι καθῃρημένον, τὸν δὲ κληρικὸν ὁμοίως ἐκπίπτειν τοῦ κλήρου. Εἰ δὲ λαϊκός τις εἴη, καὶ οὗτοι ἀναθεματιζέσθωσαν, καθὼς προείρηται.

[w] Conc. Ephes. (tom. iii. p. 666, B. 4.) Αὐτοὺς ἀκοινωνήτους ποιήσαντες, καὶ περιελόντες αὐτῶν πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν ἱερατικὴν, ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι βλάπτειν δι' οἰκείων ἀποφάσεων.



Digitized by Google

should be deprived of the power of doing hurt. And, in another place, they declare this John and his adherents to be cast out of the Church,[x] and to "have no power or faculty, as from any authority of the priesthood, either to hurt or benefit any one thereby, until they should condemn themselves, and confess their fault: which if they did not do in a short time, they might be sure the utmost severity of the canons would be exercised upon them;" that is, they should be irreversibly degraded, without hopes of restitution. Nothing can be plainer than these words, to take away all authority of the priesthood from such clerks as were legally deposed by the just power of the keys in the Church. It took away the whole δύναμις, ἐξουσία, αὐθεντία ἱερατικὴ, the whole 'power, authority: and spiritual efficacy of the priesthood,' from them. They might do the acts of a priest, bind or absolve, but those would be of no spiritual efficacy, because done without authority; their bindings would hurt no man, nor their absolutions benefit him, because the authentical power of the priesthood was wanting in them. They did not then dream of such a notion of the indelible character of the priesthood, as some have advanced since, as if a man could act with the absolute authority of a priest, when God and Christ, and the best authority in the Church, had taken his authority from him. The very opponents of this Council had no such opinion, but only pleaded they were unjustly deposed; and therefore, to be quits with Cyril and his Council, John of Antioch and his faction took upon them to depose Cyril and the Council, as Apollinarians; and they did it much in the same form of words as the other had used towards them: for so Liberatus, in giving an account of this Council, represents it. John, and his faction of thirty bishops, sent them a sentence of deposition in these words:[y] "Know ye, thou Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, and

[x] Conc. Ephes. act. v. (p. 653, A. 11.) Ἀλλότριος ἔστω αὐτός τε Ἰωάννης καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ τοῦτο δραματουργήσαντες . . . τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς κοινωνίας, μηδεμίαν ἔχοντες ἄδειαν, ὡς ἐξ αὐθεντίας ἱερατικῆς, εἰς τὸ δύνασθαί τινὰς βλάπτειν ἢ ταύτης, ἢ ὠφελεῖν, ἄχρις ἂν ἑαυτῶν καταγνόντες, τὸ οἰκεῖον ὁμολογήσωσι σφάλμα· εἰδότες, ὅτι εἰ μὴ τοῦτο ἐν τάχει ποιήσαιεν, τὴν τελείαν ἐκ τῶν κανόνων ἐφ' ἑαυτοὺς ἐπισκάσονται ἀπόφασιν.

[y] Liberat. Breviar. c. vi. (Labbé, vol. v. p. 746, D.) Scitote quod depositi estis

Digitized by Google

thou Memnon, bishop of Ephesus, that ye are deposed, and deprived of your episcopacy, and all ecclesiastical ministry whatsoever." And the same may be seen in the first session of the Council of Ephesus, where the acts of the schismatical synod are related.[z] To this Cyril, and the Council of Ephesus, replied, upon the aforesaid Catholic principles, that the sentence of deposition pronounced against them was of no authority or force, because the thirty bishops who decreed it, were divested of legal power; they had no authority as priests to sit judges upon others; they had lost the power of the keys, and their excommunications or absolutions were equally insignificant, because they were not men rightly qualified to perform such actions:[a] "For of those thirty bishops, some of them were mere wanderers, without any Churches; others had been legally deposed many years ago by their metropolitans, for great and scandalous offences; and some of them were Pelagian and Cælestian heretics; and others had been ejected out of Thessaly as criminals, who now pretended, with John of Antioch, to depose or excommunicate a universal synod: which was an impious pretence to an authority which they had not the least claim to, who had only the name of bishops, without the power, which they had forfeited by being justly deposed." Does not all this suppose, in the judgment of this Council, that heretics, and schismatics, and degraded clerks, lose

et alieni ab episcopatu, tu Cyrille Alexandrine episcope, et tu Memnon hujus civitatis, et omni ecclesiastico ministerio alieni.

[z] Conc. Ephes. act. i. tom. iii. Conc. p. 590, sub hoc titulo: Commentarii gestorum apud Orientales episcopos, in quibus sanctissimos Cyrillum ac Memnonem deponunt, et omnes qui ad sanctam synodum convenerant, excommunicant. —— Ibid. p. 598. Tu Cyrille Alexandrine, et tu Memnon hujus civitatis episcope, scitote vos depositos, et ab episcopatu alienos, atque ab omni ministerio ecclesiastico et functione esse amotos, &c.

[a] Conc. Ephes. Epist. Synod. ad Cælestin. act. i. (Labbé, vol. iii. p. 664, A. 9.) Συλλίξας ὅσπερ κολλήγιον ἑαυτῷ τριάκοντά που τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἀνθρώπων, ἐπισκόπων ἐχόντων ὄνομα, ὧν οἱ μὲν εἰσιν ἀπόλιδες, σχολάζοντες δὲ, καὶ ἐκκλησίας μὴ ἔχοντες, ἕτεροι δὲ καὶ πρὸς πολλῶν ἐτῶν, ἐπὶ δειναῖς αἰτίαις καθῃρημένοι ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδίων μητροπολιτῶν, σὺν αὐτοῖς δὲ καὶ Πελαγιανοὶ, καὶ Κελεστιανοὶ, καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ Θεσσαλίας ἐκκεκληκότων τινὲς, πρᾶγμα τετόλμηκεν ἀνόσιον, ὃ μηδεὶς πώποτε τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ· συνάπτει γὰρ καταμόνας χαρτίον, καὶ δὴ καθαιρέσιως ὄνομα καὶ ὕβριν προσετρίψατο τῷ ἁγιωτάτῳ καὶ θεοσεβεστάτῳ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐπισκόπῳ Κυρίλλῳ, κ. τ. λ.

Digitized by Google

their ministerial authority by a legal deposition; so that thenceforward they have no authority to bind or loose, to excommunicate or absolve, or perform authoritatively any other acts of the ministerial function? If it does not, I despair of ever understanding men's meaning by their words. But, if it does, then it is undeniably evident, that priests may be divested of their ministerial authority, in the opinion of this general Council.

It were easy to transcribe almost half a volume upon the same subject, out of the several acts and records of this Council; but that my friend may not complain again, that I send him to books, which he cannot easily come by, I will here subjoin two or three canons of this Council, which are in every one's hands; and they are as full to the purpose, as what has been already alleged out of the Acts of the Synod.

The preface to these canons is their Encyclical Epistle to all Churches, wherein they speak of those thirty schismatical bishops, who made a separate synod, under John of Antioch, of whom they give the same account and character as we have heard before:[b] "That they had no power or faculty, as from any authority of the priesthood, either to hurt or benefit any one thereby; because some of them were deposed, but especially because they embraced the opinions of Nestorius and Cælestius: and therefore the holy synod, by a common decree, excluded them from all ecclesiastical communion, and took from them all the power or energy of the priesthood, which enabled them to do good or hurt to others." Their meaning is, that they deprived them of all authority, as priests, to excommunicate or absolve, or perform any other ministerial acts that might have a spiritual effect on others: and if this did not render them unauthorized persons, it is hard to say what would. Their first canon is levelled against all such metropolitans as forsook

[b] Conc. Ephes. Ep. Encycl. (Labbé, vol. iii. p. 803.) Οἵτινες τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς κοινωνίας ἔχοντες ἄδειαν ὡς ἐξ αὐθεντείας ἱερατικῆς, εἰς τὸ δύνασθαί τινας ἐκ ταύτης βλάπτειν ἢ ὠφελεῖν, διὰ τὸ καί τινας ἐν αὐτοῖς εἶναι καθῃρημένους, πρὸ πάντων μὲν τὰ Νεστορίου καὶ τὰ Κελεστίου φρονήματα ἐπιφερόμενοι σαφέστατα ἀπεδείχθησαν ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ἑλέσθαι μεθ' ἡμῶν Νεστορίου καταψηφίσασθαι. οὓς τινας δόγματι κοινῷ ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος πάσης μὲν ἐκκλησιαστικῆς κοινωνίας ἀλλοτρίους ἐποίησε, πᾶσαν δὲ αὐτῶν ἐνέργειαν ἱερατικὴν περιεῖλε, δι' ἧς ἠδύναντο βλάπτειν ἢ ὠφελεῖν τινάς.

Digitized by Google

the œcumenical synod, and joined with the schismatical conventicle, or embraced the heresy of Cælestius:[c] "Such an one should have no power to do any thing against his provincial bishops, being cast out of all ecclesiastical communion by the synod, and rendered uncapable of performing any ecclesiastical office: nay, he should be subjected to the bishops of his own province, and the neighbouring metropolitans, in every thing, being degraded from the order of episcopacy." In the next canon they determine the same against all bishops that joined in the schismatical synod,[d] "That they, according to the decree of the holy synod, were altogether divested of the priesthood, and fallen from their order." These are not the words of men that supposed that heretics or schismatics, or deposed priests, could act still with the authority of priests, after they were degraded and fallen from their order.

In the third canon they decree,[e] that all such clerks as were interdicted the priestly office by Nestorius, for their orthodoxy, should be restored to their station again: and thenceforward no clerk should be subject to an apostatizing bishop upon any account, or in any respect whatsoever. This certainly supposes that degraded heretics had no longer authority, as bishops or priests, to censure or exact obe-

[c] Conc. Ephes. c. i. (Labbé, vol. iii. p. 803.) Εἴ τις μητροπολίτης τῆς ἐπαρχίας, ἀποστατήσας τῆς ἁγίας καὶ οἰκουμενικῆς συνόδου, προσίοιτο τῷ τῆς ἀποστασίας συνεδρίῳ, ἢ μιτὰ τοῦτο προστιθείη, ἢ τὰ Κελεστίου ἐφρόνησεν, ἢ φρονήσῃ, οὗτος κατὰ τῶν τῆς ἐπαρχίας ἐπισκόπων διαπράττεσθαί τι οὐδαμῶς δύναται, πάσης ἐκκλησιαστικῆς κοινωνίας ἐντεῦθεν ἤδη ὑπὸ τῆς συνόδου ἐκβεβλημένος, καὶ ἀνενέργητος ὑπάρχων, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοῖς τοῖς τῆς ἐπαρχίας ἐπισκόποις, καὶ τοῖς πέριξ μητροπολίταις, τοῖς τὰ τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας φρονοῦσιν ὑποκείσεται, εἰς τὸ πάντῃ καὶ τοῦ βαθμοῦ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἐκβεβληθῆναι.

[d] Can. ii. (Labbé, vol. iii. p. 803.) Εἰ δέ τινες ἐπαρχιῶται ἐπίσκοποι ἀπειλίφθησαν τῆς ἁγίας συνόδου, καὶ τῇ ἀποστασίᾳ προσετέθησαν, ἢ προστεθῆναι πεφαθεῖεν, ἢ καὶ ὑπογεγράψαντες τῇ Νεστορίου καθαιρέσει ἐπαλινδόμησαν πρὸς τὸ τῆς ἀποστασίας συνέδριον, τούτους πάντῃ κατὰ τὴν δόξαν τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ ἀλλοτρίους εἶναι τῆς ἱερωσύνης, καὶ τοῦ βαθμοῦ ἐκπίπτειν.

[e] Can. iii. (Labbé, vol. iii. p. 806.) Εἰ δέ τινες καὶ τῶν ἐν ἑκάστῃ πόλει ἢ χώρᾳ κληρικῶν ὑπὸ Νεστορίου καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ ὄντων τῆς ἱερωσύνης ἐκωλύθησαν διὰ τὸ ὀρθῶς φρονεῖν, ἰδικαιώσαμεν καὶ τούτους τὸν ἴδιον ἀπολαβεῖν βαθμόν. κοινῶς δὲ τοὺς τῇ ὀρθοδόξῳ καὶ οἰκουμενικῇ συνόδῳ συμφρονοῦντας κληρικοὺς κελεύομεν τοῖς ἀποστατήσασιν ἢ ἀφισταμένοις ἐπισκόποις μηδόλως ὑποκεῖσθαι κατὰ μηδένα τρόπον.

Digitized by Google

dience from their subjects. And yet the power of the keys was one of the most authentic and appropriate ingredients of the episcopacy and priesthood: but they having lost both the key of knowledge and the key of government, submission and obedience to them, as priests and ministers of God, in this degraded state, was no longer due unto them.

In the fourth canon they decree,[f] that if any clerks apostatize, and, either publicly or privately, hold the opinions of Nestorius or Cælestius, they are deposed by the holy synod, *Τούτους εἶναι καθῃρημένους.*

And in the fifth canon,[g] if any clerks are condemned by this holy synod, or their own bishops for their crimes; and Nestorius, or any of his accomplices, attempt to restore them to communion, or to their order; this shall not profit them: they are to remain deposed notwithstanding. Whence it is plain, that Nestorius, being legally deposed, had no authority to absolve or restore any to communion, by virtue of any indelible character of a bishop remaining in him. And, though he had absolved them a thousand times, his authority would have signified nothing, till the Church, by her authentic and authoritative acts, had reinstated them.

In the sixth canon,[h] all who shall pretend to evacuate or set aside any of the acts of the Council of Ephesus, if they be bishops or clerks, they 'do totally fall from their order,' *τοῦ οἰκείου παντελῶς ἀποπίπτειν βαθμοῦ*, and, if laymen, they are excommunicate. And can men have the authority of priests or bishops, when they are totally fallen from their order? No, certainly: no more than laymen have a right

[f] Can. iv. (Labbé, vol. iii. p. 806.) *Εἰ δέ τινες ἀποστατήσαιεν τῶν κληρικῶν, καὶ τολμήσαιεν ἢ κατ' ἰδίαν ἢ δημοσίᾳ τὰ Νεστορίου ἢ τὰ Κελεστίου φρονῆσαι, καὶ τούτους εἶναι καθῃρημένους ὑπὸ τῆς ἁγίας συνόδου διδικαίωται.*

[g] Can. v. (Labbé, vol. iii. p. 806.) *Ὅσοι δὲ ἐπὶ ἀτόποις πράξεσι κατεκρίθησαν ὑπὸ τῆς ἁγίας συνόδου, ἢ ὑπὸ τῶν οἰκείων ἐπισκόπων, καὶ τούτοις ἀπανενίστως κατὰ τὴν ἐν ἅπασιν ἀδιαφορίαν αὐτοῦ ὁ Νεστόριος, καὶ εἰ τὰ αὐτοῦ φρονοῦντες ἀποδοῦναι ἐπειράθησαν ἢ περαθεῖεν κοινωνίαν, ἢ βαθμὸν, ἀνωφελήτους εἶναι, καὶ μένειν, καὶ τούτους, καὶ εἶναι οὐδὲν ἧττον καθῃρημένους ἰδικαιώσαμεν.*

[h] Can. vi. (Labbé, vol. iii. p. 806.) *Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἴ τινες βουληθεῖεν τὰ περὶ ἑκάστων πεπραγμένα ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ τῇ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ οἱῳδήποτε τρόπῳ παρασαλεύειν, ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος ὥρισεν, εἰ μὲν ἐπίσκοποι εἶεν, ἢ κληρικοὶ, τοῦ οἰκείου παντελῶς ἀποπίπτειν βαθμοῦ· εἰ δὲ λαϊκοὶ, ἀκοινωνήτους ὑπάρχειν.*

Digitized by Google

or authority to demand the communion, whilst they are excommunicate by the Council.

The last canon decrees,[1] that if any one use the impious creed of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, proposed by Charisius in the Council, or any other creed beside that of Nice, "if they were bishops, they were deprived of their episcopal order, and if clerks, deprived of their clerical order," and, if laymen, they were anathematized, or under the sentence of the greater excommunication.

These seven are all the canons which the Council of Ephesus made; and we see they are all upon this one point, to take away the ministerial authority of bishops and priests from them, in case of heresy, or any such crime, for which they incurred the censures of the synod: and a man may as well say, that black is white, as say, that the Council of Ephesus thought these men had still the authority of ministers of Christ, when they, by the authority of God and Christ, had taken their authority from them. And yet the baptisms given by such men in this unauthorized state, were not repeated; the persons they baptized, while they were divested of their ministerial power, were not rebaptized when they came over to the Church, but only received with imposition of hands and confirmation, as I have shewed, particularly of the Nestorians, in the first part of this Scholastical History, to which I refer the reader.

## SECT. V. — *How the Council of Chalcedon deposed Eutyches and Dioscorus, and their Adherents.*

Come we now to the fourth general Council, the great Council of Chalcedon, where above six hundred bishops met, under Marcian, the emperor (an. 451), to condemn the heresies of Eutyches and Dioscorus, who denied the consubstantiality of Christ's human nature with that of ours, as Arius had denied the consubstantiality of his Divine nature

[1] Can. vii. [Not. In editione Labbei, sex tantum canones habentur: in quibusdam autem aliis additur, sub nomine vii. canonis, definitio ejusdem synodi, post relationem Charisii edita, quæ habetur, p. 689, apud Labbeum.—Grischow.] See notes (t) and (u). Ἀλλοτρίους εἶναι τοὺς ἐπισκόπους τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, καὶ τοὺς κληρικοὺς τοῦ κλήρου· εἰ δὲ λαϊκοὶ εἶεν, ἀναθεματίζεσθαι.

Digitized by Google

with that of the Father. Eutyches had been once condemned before in the Council of Constantinople, under Flavian (an. 448), the acts of which Council are inserted into the first action or session of the Council of Chalcedon. There we find the first sentence of deprivation passed upon him in these terms, by Flavian and fifty-six bishops and archimandrites:[j] "We decree him, by the power of our Lord Jesus Christ whom he hath blasphemed, to be deprived of his priestly order, and our communion, and the superintendency of his monastery; and all those who converse with him, to be obnoxious to the same excommunication." And there they call him only 'a quondam presbyter,' ὁ πάλαι πρεσβύτερος, as supposing him to be no longer a presbyter after he was thus deposed from his order. This decree, indeed, was pretendedly cancelled by the second Council of Ephesus, commonly called 'the latrocinal synod,' or 'the synod of robbers,' because it turned the temple of God into a den of thieves, by condemning Flavian, and absolving Eutyches,[k] at the instigation of Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria. But the attempt of this synod was quickly reversed, by the authority of the great Council of Chalcedon,[l] which condemned both Dioscorus and Eutyches in a very remarkable manner. Dioscorus is often deposed in these forms: Διόσκορον ὁ Θεὸς καθεῖλεν, 'God hath deposed Dioscorus;' "Christ hath deposed the murderer:"[m] "The holy synod hath divested him of episcopal dignity, and deprived him of all the honour and ministry of the priesthood."[n]

[j] Conc. Constantin. act. vii. in act. i. Concil. Chalced. (Labbé, vol. iv. p. 229, D.) Ὡρίσαμεν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ βλασφημηθέντος, ἀλλότριον αὐτὸν εἶναι παντὸς ἱερατικοῦ τάγματος, καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἡμᾶς κοινωνίας, καὶ τοῦ προεστάναι μοναστηρίου· ἰδόντων ἐκείνων πάντων τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα διαλεγομένων αὐτῷ, ἢ συνευγχανόντων, ὡς ὑπεύθυνοι ἔσονται καὶ αὐτοὶ τῷ τῆς ἀκοινωνησίας ἐπιτιμίῳ, ὡς μὴ ἀποστάντες τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁμιλίας.

[k] Vid. Act. Conc. Ephes. secundi in actione prima. —— Concil. Chalced. Labbé, vol. v. p. 256, seq.

[l] Conc. Chalced. act. ii. p. 371.

[m] Ibid. act. i. edit. Crabb. p. 831, Labbé, vol. iv. p. 323, C. 3.

[n] Ibid. act. iii. (p. 847, edit. Crabb.) (p. 427, edit. Labbé.) See the several subscriptions of particular bishops in that session; Labbé, vol. iv. p. 439. Cyrus episcopus Siniandi civitatis dixit: 'Ego alienum eum judico a pontificatus collegio et omni sacerdotali ministerio.' Another says: 'Dignus est alienus esse a sacerdotali ordine, et ab omni ministerio et communione,' &c.

Digitized by Google

And it is further remarkable, that in the sentence of deposition pronounced against him, they declare him deprived of all sacerdotal grace and office, without hopes of restitution,[o] because he contumaciously contemned the citations and admonitions of the synod. Liberatus takes notice of the same things in his account of this Council. He says,[p] "The whole Council cried out, 'God hath deposed Dioscorus, God hath deposed the murderer!'" And that they gave it in command to the clergy of Alexandria, then present at Chalcedon, that they should not henceforward esteem him a bishop, but look upon him as one entirely degraded from his order. And because some thought that Dioscorus might recover his bishoprick again, they published an edict, declaring Dioscorus to be irrecoverably deprived of his honour. Can any thing be more solemn, full, or authentic, than this deposition? Which is said to be done by God and Christ; which deprives him not only of episcopacy, but of all ecclesiastical ministry and sacred function; which orders his own clergy to look upon him as no bishop, but as an abject or castaway, irrecoverably degraded, without hopes of restitution; that he was expelled the college of bishops, and the order of priests, and had now not so much as the name or appellation of a bishop left him. Can any man think they took him for an authorized minister of Christ, after they themselves, by the power of Christ, had so solemnly un-

[o] Conc. Chalced. act. iii. in Edicto cont. Dioscorum, (Labbé, vol. iv. p. 159.) *Γίνωσκε σεαυτὸν διὰ τὴν κατὰ τῶν θείων κανόνων ὑπερηφάνειαν, καὶ διὰ τὴν ἀπείθειάν σου τὴν περὶ τὴν ἁγίαν ταύτην καὶ οἰκουμενικὴν σύνοδον, ὑπὲρ ὧν πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις σου πλημμελήμασιν, οἷς ἰάλως, καὶ τρίτον κληθεὶς παρὰ τῆς ἁγίας ταύτης καὶ μεγάλης συνόδου κατὰ τοὺς θείους κανόνας, ἐπὶ τῷ ἀποκρίνασθαι τοῖς ἐπαγομένοις σοι, οὐκ ἀπήντησας, ὑπερημερίᾳ μηνὶ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος τρισκαιδεκάτῃ, παρὰ τῆς ἁγίας καὶ οἰκουμενικῆς συνόδου καθαιρεῖσθαι τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, καὶ παντὸς ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ θεσμοῦ ὑπάρχειν ἀλλότριον.* —— Ibid. p. 461, E. 6. *Τόδε τὸ γράμμα ἰδικαιώσαμεν προστεθῆναι, διασημαίνοντες, ὡς ὁ παρὰ τοῦ δεσπότου Θεοῦ, καὶ παρὰ τοσαύτης πληθύος ἐπισκόπων, δι' ὧν ἀσύγγνωστα δέδρακε, τῆς κατὰ τὴν εἰρωσύνην χάριτος ἀφαιρεθείς, οὐδεμίαν τοσούτολον ἴσχει ἀποκαταστάσεως ἐλπίδα.*

[p] Liberat. Breviar. c. xiii. (Labbé, tom. v. Conc. p. 761.) Acclamavit omne Concilium, 'Dioscorum Deus deposuit, homicidam Deus deposuit.' (A. 13.) Clericis vero Alexandrinis mandavit Concilium, jam eum non putare episcopum esse, sed omnino cognoscerent eum de gradu suo esse dejectum. Sed et aliquibus putantibus Dioscorum recuperare posse episcopatum, propositum est edictum, et omnibus manifestatum est Dioscorum irrecuperabiliter honore fuisse abjectum.

Digitized by Google

authorized him, without hopes of restitution? Whatever there may be in the indelible character of a bishop or priest, it is certain this Council did not think it authorized him to act as a lawful bishop, after so full and ample a deposition. Though we should suppose it preserved him in a capacity to minister as a priest, without a new ordination, if ever the Council should think fit to restore him to his ministerial authority again; yet he could not be said to minister with authority, whilst he remained in that deposed state, and all the power of heaven and earth had taken his authority from him. And yet we nowhere read, that the baptisms given by Dioscorus, or his adherents, were at any time repeated; or that any Eutychians were rebaptized upon their return to the Catholic Church.

The condemnation of Eutyches himself was parallel to this of Dioscorus. I shall but trouble the reader with one instance of it, out of the edict of the Emperor Marcian, where he confirms the acts and sentence of the Council against him. In Crabb's edition it is inserted into the third session of the Council, p. 866. But in Labbé's edition it is found at the end of all the acts, among other records relating to this Council; and it is in these words:[q] "By this law we decree, that they who are deceived by the errors of Eutyches, shall have no bishop, nor presbyter, nor have, nor create, nor name any men clerks: and that Eutyches himself shall be totally deprived of the name of presbyter, of which he is unworthy and divested. But if any shall presume, against this our order, to create bishops, or presbyters, or other clerks; both they that create such clerks, and they that are so created, or assume to themselves the degree of clerks, shall have their goods confiscated and be confined

[q] Edict. Marciani ad calcem Conc. Chalced. part. iii. c. xii. (Labbé, vol. iv. p. 867, E. 4.) Διὰ τοῦδε τοῦ νόμου διισχίζομεν, τοὺς ὑπὸ τῆς μανίας Εὐτυχοῦς ἀπατωμένους . . . μηδένα ἔχειν πρεσβύτερον, μηδέ τινας κληρικοὺς ἢ ἔχειν, ἢ ὀνομάζειν. Καὶ αὐτὸν Εὐτυχῆ τῆς τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου προσηγορίας, ἧς ἀνάξιος ὢν ἐγυμνώθη, καθόλου στερίσκεσθαι. εἰ δέ τινες ἀντικρὺ τῶν παρ' ἡμῶν ὁρισθέντων, ἐπισκόπους, ἢ πρεσβυτέρους, ἢ καὶ λοιποὺς κληρικοὺς χειροτονῆσαι τολμήσειεν, αὐτούς τε τοὺς χειροτονουμένους, καὶ τοὺς χειροτονοῦντας, ἢ περιποιοῦντας ἑαυτοῖς κατὰ πρόληψιν τὸν βαθμὸν τὸν τῶν κληρικῶν, μετὰ τὸ καταδικασθῆναι τῇ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ἀποβολῇ, καὶ ἐξορίᾳ διηνεκεῖ σύσχιβῆναι προστάττομεν.

Digitized by Google

to perpetual banishment." Now then, if, according to the sentence of the Council and this ratification of it, Eutyches and his adherents were so deprived of all ministerial offices, that they were not so much as to have the very name of bishops or presbyters allowed them, nor might create any under those titles; what authority could the Eutychians have after this to minister baptism, or perform any other acts of the ministerial function? They might do the things indeed, but they had no authority to do them: they were as much usurpers of the office as the merest laymen. All the difference was, that the one never had authority; and the other once had authority, but forfeited and lost, and, by their heresy and obstinacy, reduced themselves to a state and condition one degree below laymen, by suffering themselves to be legally anathematized and cast out of the communion of the Church. And yet, after all, the canons assure us, that they who were baptized in due form by these unauthorized usurpers, were not rebaptized, but only had their deficiencies supplied and completed by imposition of hands and a proper form of confirmation.

I could give other instances to the purpose, out of the remaining acts of this Council, but I choose rather to say something of its canons; among which there are no less than eight, which specify certain crimes for which a clerk is deposed or fallen from his order. The second canon is against ordination for money: in which case both the ordainer and ordained, and also any other, who is instrumental or a mediator in the crime, if he be a clerk, is deprived of his order, Τοῦ οἰκείου ἐκπιπτέτω βαθμοῦ. So if a clerk forsakes his own Church without leave, by the tenth canon he incurs the same censure, Ἐκπίπτειν τοῦ ἰδίου βαθμοῦ. If a bishop procure his see by a pragmatic sanction, to be erected into a metropolis, to the prejudice of his lawful metropolitan, by the twelfth canon he makes himself liable to the like degradation.

By the eighteenth canon, clergymen, who are found guilty of treason or conspiracy against the civil government, are wholly to be degraded from their order, Ἐκπιπτέτωσαν πάντη τοῦ οἰκείου βαθμοῦ.

Digitized by Google

By the twenty-second canon, clergymen who commit robbery upon the goods of a deceased bishop, are liable also to be deposed.

And they, who under pretence of marriage, take women by force, or give assistance to any that do so, are, by the twenty-seventh canon, subjected to the same censure.

The twenty-ninth canon says, it is sacrilege to degrade a bishop to the order of presbyter: but if a just cause removes him from the episcopal function, then he ought not to retain the place of a presbyter.

Now, upon all these canons I desire to know whether, if a clerk be formally and judicially deposed from his order, as these canons suppose, he has then any longer authority to exercise the ministerial offices of his function? To say, he has authority still, seems to fly in the face of all these canons, and cut the sinews of all ecclesiastical discipline, and leave the Church without a just power of censure. But supposing him to have no authority after such a deposition, what if, in spite and contradiction to these canons, he will go and join with heretics, or set up a παρασυναγωγὴ 'a conventicle,' of his own, erect an altar against an altar, and there baptize, and perform all other acts of the ministerial function, as many degraded bishops and presbyters did: the question is, Whether all persons, baptized by such a degraded unauthorized bishop or priest, were rebaptized by the Catholic Church? If they were, my learned opponents might easily have produced some order of one of these general councils to have proved it: if they were not rebaptized, as it is evident they were not, then it is reasonable to conclude, as I here do, that the bare want of authority in the administrator of baptism, did not wholly annul or make void the baptism that was given in due form by an unauthorized person; but had its want of authority, with its other deficiencies, supplied by the authority of the Church in a subsequent imposition of hands and confirmation: as is clearly evinced from the history of these four first general councils, compared with what has been said before of the method of receiving such as were baptized by heretics and schismatics into the communion of the Catholic Church.

Digitized by Google

This argument, I think, carries with it the conviction and strength of a demonstration. The baptism of heretics, and schismatics, and degraded clerks, and excommunicated clerks, is the baptism of unauthorized persons, according to the sense of the four first general Councils:—

But the baptism of heretics, schismatics, degraded clerks, and excommunicated clerks, if ministered in due form, was always received by the Church without rebaptizing:—

Therefore, the baptism of unauthorized persons, if ministered in due form, was always received by the Church without rebaptizing.

SECT. VI.—*Of the Condemnation of Anthimus and Severus in the Council of Constantinople, under Mennas (an. 536).*

But I go on with the present history. There are two synods of Constantinople, which lay some claim to the title and appellation of the fifth general Council, both of them in the time of Justinian, the former under Mennas, patriarch of Constantinople (an. 536), and the other under Pope Vigilius (an. 553). In Crabb's edition of the Councils, that under Mennas has the name of the fifth general Council; but in Labbé, the title is given to the latter. I shall join them together, and out of both we shall be sure to have a general council. That under Mennas was called against Anthimus, bishop of Trebisond; Severus, bishop of Antioch; Peter, bishop of Apamea; and Zoaras, a monk; with other heretics, who went by the name of Acephali, and were a branch of the Eutychian heresy, but they were called Acephali, that is, 'without head,' because the first authors of the sect at Alexandria separated from their bishop, and held conventicles, and gave baptisms in private houses, which are therefore frequently called παρασυναγωγαὶ and παραβαπτίσματα, in the acts of this Council. Anthimus was first condemned by Pope Agapetus, whose epistle was read in council, declaring him[r] "to be neither worthy the name of a Catholic, nor the name of a priest." And this sentence was ratified and confirmed over and over again by the Council,

[r] Agapet. Epist. ad Petrum, in act. i. Conc. sub Menna, (Labbé, vol. v. p. 48, C. 11.) Οὐδὲ καθολικοῦ οὐδὲ ἱερέως ὀνόματος ἄξιον εἶναι ψηφίζομαι.

Digitized by Google

who more solemnly pronounced him[s] "to be cast out of the priesthood, and divested for the future of all sacred appellation, dignity, energy, or power whatsoever." And in another place,[t] excommunication is added to the sentence of deposition: so that nothing could be wanting to deprive him of all manner of sacerdotal authority and power. The like sentence of deposition was pronounced against Severus, by four several synods, whose synodical epistles are related and approved in this Council, viz. the synod of Jerusalem, the synod of Tyre, the synod of Syria Secunda, and a former synod of Constantinople, whose sentence runs in these words,[u] "We subject this Severus to a perpetual anathema, and deprive him of all honour, name, dignity, operation, or power belonging to a priest or a Christian, and exclude him from the holy communion, according to the canons." After this deposition, Justinian published an imperial edict against them, which is still extant among his Novels,[v] wherein he confirms all that had been done by the Church in the deposition of Anthimus, Severus, Peter, and Zoaras, and their accomplices, forbidding them to hold conventicles, or to baptize, or give the eucharist, or preach, or do any other office of the sacerdotal function. Now, it is well known, that notwithstanding both the deprivation of so many synods, and the imperial edicts against them, these men set up conventicles, and

[s] Act. iv. Conc. sub Menna, (Labbé, vol. v. p. 92, A. 10.) Ἱερωσύνης ἔξω καθιστάναι συγχωρεῖμεν, πάσης τι ἐνέρας αὐτὸν ἱερατικῆς προσηγορίας ἅμα καὶ ἀξίας καὶ ἐνεργείας ἀλλότριον εἶναι τοῦ λοιποῦ.

[t] Ibid. (Labbé, vol. v. p. 89, A. 2.) Συνορᾶμεν . . . καθάπαξ αὐτὸν ὡς μίλος ἄχρηστον καὶ σιγηπτὸς ἀποξηθῆναι τοῦ σώματος τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησιῶν, καὶ τῆς Τραπεζουντίων ἐπισκοπῆς ἔξω γινόμενον, καὶ πάσης ἱερᾶς ἀλλοτριούμενον ἀξίας καὶ ἐνεργείας, καὶ κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου πάπα ψῆφον, τῆς τοῦ καθολικοῦ προσηγορίας.

[u] Conc. CP. in actione I. Conc. sub Menna, p. 36, edit. Crabb. Hunc juste perpetuo anathemati subjicimus, omni honore, nomine, dignitate, operatione (in Greek, ἐνέργεια) tam Christiano quam hieratico conveniente privantes, et nudum Divinæ communionis statuentes.

[v] Justin. Novel. xlii. c. iii. (Vid. etiam Conc. tom. v. p. 268, E. 13.) Θεσπίζομεν ἕκαστον τῶν τοιούτων τὴν ἡσυχίαν ἄγειν, καὶ μηδὲ συγκαλεῖν εἰς ἑαυτόν τινας, μήτε προσιόντας δέχεσθαι, ἢ παραβαπτίζειν θαρρεῖν, ἢ τὴν ἱερὰν κοινωνίαν χυκαίνειν, καὶ ταύτης μεταδιδόναι τισὶν, ἢ τὰς ἀπηγορευμένας διδασκαλίας ὑφηγεῖσθαι.

Digitized by Google

administered baptism therein. For complaint was made of this against Zoaras, the monk, in the Council under Mennas,[w] and he and his accomplices were again censured upon it by the general sentence of the synod. But those censures did not extend to the rebaptization of all such as had been baptized by these unauthorized persons. The heretics were indeed divested of ministerial power, but those whom they baptized, were received as the laws directed the Eutychians should be, by imposition of hands, without rebaptizing, upon their repentance.

SECT. VII.—*How the Defenders of the* Tria Capitula *were degraded in the Fifth General Council of Constantinople.*

The other Council of Constantinople under Justinian, (an. 553), which, in the new editions of the Councils, now bears the title of the fifth general Council, consisted of one hundred and sixty-five bishops, who were called together to condemn the *Tria Capitula*, *i. e.* three noted books, which the Nestorians made great use of to defend their heresy, which were, the Writings of Theodorus, of Mopsuestia: the Epistle of Maris to Ibas, the Persian; and the Reflections of Theodoret upon Cyril of Alexandria. Here also the errors of Origen were condemned. But all these were dead men, and gone to another world to answer for themselves. All, therefore, that the censures or anathemas of the Council could signify to them, was little, save only as they were of use to reclaim the living, and deter them from embracing or encouraging the errors of the dead. And, to do this effectually, they made a solemn decree,[x] "That if any one endeavoured, either by teaching or writing, to propagate tenets contrary to what had been piously determined in the

[w] Conc. Constant. sub Menna, act. i. p. 70, edit. Crabb. (Labbé, vol. v. p. 26, D.) Quamquam piissimus imperator noster mandaverit, ut conventus non agerent, neque illegitime baptizarent [non reconventiculare, neque rebaptizare], Zoaras tamen tale præceptum despexit, et illegitime baptizavit in die Paschæ non paucos.

[x] Constant. Conc. V. General. Collat. viii. (Labbé, vol. v. p. 579, B. 9.) Εἴ τις ἐπιχειρήσει ἐναντία τοῖς παρ' ἡμῶν εὐσεβῶς διατυπωθεῖσι παραδοῦναι, ἢ διδάξαι, ἢ γράψαι, εἰ μὲν ἐπίσκοπος εἴη, ἢ ὢν κλήρῳ ἀναφερόμενος, ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀλλότρια ἱερέων καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς καταστάσεως πράττων, γυμνωθήσεται τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, ἢ τοῦ κλήρου. εἰ δὲ μοναχὸς, ἢ λαϊκὸς, ἀναθεματίσθησεται.

Digitized by Google

Council; if he were a bishop or a clerk, he should be deprived of his episcopal or clerical order; or, if he were a monk or layman, he should be anathematized." Now, here it is very obvious for any one to observe, that as being anathematized deprives a monk or layman of all the power and privilege of church-communion that belongs to a layman; so the deposing of a bishop or clerk from his episcopal or clerical office, deprives them of all the authority and privilege that belongs to clerical communion: and the pretence of an indelible character does no more secure any authority to them in the one case, than it does in the other. For as the indelible character of baptism does not give a layman authority and right to challenge communion, whilst he stands legally excommunicated by the Church; but only a right to be restored to communion again, when he truly repents, without a new baptism; so the indelible character of ordination does not give a bishop or priest any authority to challenge to himself the powers of clerical communion, that is, authority to perform the offices of a bishop or priest, so long as they are legally degraded by the Church; but only power or capacity to officiate again without a new ordination, if ever the Church shall think fit to give them authority so to do, by a relaxation of her censures, and permission to return to their ancient state again; which upon great necessities the Church sometimes did, but this not very often. Now, if this be the truth of the case, then all the defenders of the *Tria Capitula*, and the errors of Origen, were truly divested of clerical authority by this Council: and yet their παραβαπτίσματα, their 'unauthorized baptisms,' were not repeated: for we never read of any Nestorian or Eutychian, who, having been baptized in due form, was rebaptized in the Church.

### SECT. VIII.—*How the Sixth General Council of Constantinople deposed and anathematized the Monothelites.*

The sixth general Council was held at Constantinople, under Constantius Pogonatus (an. 680). Here met two hundred and eighty-nine bishops to condemn the heresy of the Monothelites, which were another branch of the

Digitized by Google

Eutychians, so called, because they asserted but one will in our Saviour, thereby undermining and destroying the perfection of his human nature. This heresy had, for some time, prevailed both at Rome and Constantinople: for Pope Honorius was a defender of it; who is therefore, together with Sergius, Cyrus, Paulus, and several others, frequently anathematized after death in the acts of this Council. But that which we are to inquire into is, what censures were passed upon the living. And among these, we have the deposition of Macarius, bishop of Antioch, and Stephen, a monk, one of his presbyters.

In the eighth session, Macarius, whom they call the new Dioscorus, and the new Apollinarius, is ordered, first to be divested of his pall and deprived of his bishoprick:[y] then, in the ninth session, the sentence is formally pronounced against him and Stephen, his disciple, in these words:[z] "We declare you deprived of all sacerdotal dignity and ministry." And upon this, Stephen was immediately driven out of the Council.

In the twelfth session, after having heard all that Macarius had to say, he is again declared justly and canonically deprived of his archiepiscopal habit, and all power of teaching from the doctor's chair, that he might not spread his heresy any further. And whereas he had presumed to say,[a] "If he was cut in pieces, limb from limb, and cast into the sea, he would not own two wills, or two 'operations,' ἐνεργείας, in Christ;" the Council, therefore, declares him synodically deposed and anathematized also, and wholly without right to sit ἐν ἱερατικῷ θρόνῳ, 'in the sacerdotal chair,' for the future.

In the fifteenth session, one Polychronius, a monk, pretended to work a miracle, by raising the dead, in confirma-

[y] Conc. VI. Gen. act. viii. p. 321, edit. Crabb. (Labbé, tom. vi. pp. 758, 759.) Τὸν νίον Διόσκορον ἔξω βάλλε· τοῦ νίου Ἀπολλιναρίου καὶ τὰ ἴστε· δικαίως τῆς ἱερωσυνῆς ἀλλοτριούσθω· γυμνούσθω τοῦ περικειμένου αὐτῷ ὁμοφορίου.

[z] Ibid. act. ix. p. 326, edit. Crabb. (Labbé, p. 778, E. 6.) Ὁρίζομεν ὑμᾶς πάσης ἱερατικῆς ἀξίας καὶ λειτουργίας ἀλλοτρίους ὑπάρχειν.

[a] Ibid. act. xii. (Labbé, p. 937, C. 2.) Δικαίως καὶ κανονικῶς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχιερατικοῦ σχήματος γυμνωθέντα, εὐδαμῶς ὁ θεῖος κανὼν παραδέχεται τοῦ λοιποῦ εἰς διδασκαλικὸν καθίσαι θρόνον. κ. τ. λ.



Digitized by Google

tion of the Monothelite doctrine: which he having attempted in vain, the Council condemned him as an impostor, and a blasphemer, and a manifest heretic, declaring him to be deprived of all the order and ministry of a priest. And so having deposed him, the holy synod cried out,[b] "Anathema to Polychronius and his accomplices: Anathema to Macarius, Stephanus, and Polychronius. The Trinity hath deposed these three."

At the end of the sixteenth session, they are all again anathematized with Honorius,[c] and the rest of the heretics that were dead before. And in the close of the eighteenth session, having read the Nicene and Constantinopolitan creeds, the Council concludes,[d] "That whoever presumed to compose any other faith, or propose, or teach, or hand down any other creed to new converts, turning either from Gentilism, Judaism, or any heresy; or offered to introduce any new terms, contrary to what the present Council had agreed upon; if they were bishops or clerks, they should be deprived of their episcopal or clerical order; and if laymen, be anathematized, or cast out of the Church."

In consequence of these decrees, all such bishops as herded with Macarius and the Monothelites, are declared to be out of the college of bishops, by Pope Agatho and his Roman Council, whose synodical epistle to this Council

[b] Conc. VI. Gen. act. xv. (Labbé, vol. vi. p. 999, B. 5.) Συνιδομεν τοῦτον ὡς λαοπλάνον, καὶ ἀπατεῶνα, καὶ πρόδηλον αἱρετικὸν πάσης ἱερατικῆς τάξεώς τε καὶ λειτουργίας γυμνωθῆναι. Καὶ καθαιρεθέντος αὐτοῦ, ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος ἐξεβόησεν· Πολυχρονίῳ αἱρετικῷ καὶ τοῖς ὁμόφροσιν αὐτοῦ ἀνάθεμα, Μακαρίῳ, καὶ Στεφάνῳ, καὶ τῷ Πολυχρονίῳ ἀνάθεμα· ἡ Τριὰς τοὺς τρεῖς καθεῖλεν.

[c] Ibid. act. xvi. (p. 1010.) Ὀνωρίῳ αἱρετικῷ ἀνάθεμα. . . . Μακαρίῳ, καὶ Στεφάνῳ, καὶ Πολυχρονίῳ αἱρετικοῖς ἀνάθεμα.

[d] Ibid. act. xviii. (p. 1027, C.) Τούτων τοίνυν μετὰ πάσης παντελοῦς ἀκριβείας τι καὶ ἐμμελείας παρ' ἡμῶν διατυπωθέντων, ὁρίζομεν ἑτέραν πίστιν μηδενὶ ἐξεῖναι προφέρειν, ἤγουν συγγράφειν, ἢ συντιθέναι, ἢ φρονεῖν, ἢ διδάσκειν ἑτέρως. τοὺς δὲ τολμῶντας ἢ συντιθέναι πίστιν ἑτέραν, ἢ προσομίζειν, ἢ διδάσκειν, ἢ παραδιδόναι ἕτερον σύμβολον τοῖς βουλουσιν ἐπιστρέφειν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας ἐξ Ἑλληνισμοῦ, ἢ ἐξ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ, ἢ γοῦν ἐξ αἱρέσεως οἱασοῦν, ἢ καινοφωνίαν, ἤτοι λέξεως ἐφεύρεσιν πρὸς ἀνατροπὴν εἰσάγειν τῶν νυνὶ παρ' ἡμῶν διορισθέντων· τούτους εἰ μὲν ἐπίσκοποι εἶεν, ἢ κληρικοί, ἀλλοτρίους εἶναι τοὺς ἐπισκόπους τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, καὶ τοὺς κληρικοὺς τοῦ κλήρου· εἰ δὲ μοναζοντες εἶεν, ἢ λαϊκοί, ἀναθεματίζεσθαι αὐτούς.

Digitized by Google

is related in the fourth session.[e] And Constantine Pogonatus, the emperor, in his *Sacra*, or Edict, where he confirms the acts of the Council, uses a like expression, where he says,[f] "The Council had banished all such heretical priests from the sacerdotal fold:" that is, from the confraternity and society of the sacred order. In like manner, as Leo, the second bishop of Rome, writing to this same emperor, concerning the proceedings of the present synod against Macarius and his accomplices, says,[g] "That Macarius being found to be a wolf in sheep's clothing, and a thief and a robber, instead of a shepherd, was, by the true shepherds of Christ's flock" (meaning the sixth general Council), "abdicated as a waster and destroyer: for they deposed him from his prelatical dignity, and his disciple, Stephen, with Polychronius, the new Simon Magus, from the honour of their priesthood."

How could a degradation be expressed in more ample and significant terms than these? They are deposed, not only from the honour and chair, but from the ministry, the order, and the offices of the priesthood; from preaching, and all other operations belonging to the sacred function. And they are deposed not only by man, but God: for "the Holy Trinity deposed them." And being so, they were no longer owned by the rest of the bishops, as fellow-bishops, or fellow-ministers, or spiritual brethren; but looked upon as

[e] Conc. Roman. in act. iv. Conc. VI. General. p. 689. Qui vero hæc confiteri noluerint, ut infestos Catholicæ atque apostolicæ confessioni, perpetuæ condemnationis reos esse censemus, nec aliquando tales in nostræ humilitatis collegio nisi correctos suscipere patimur.

[f] Constantin. Edict. ad calcem, (Labbé, vol. vi. p. 1085, E. 7.) Ἡ τις ἁγία σύνοδος ἔκαστα δοκιμάσασά τε καὶ ἀναφείνασα τοὺς μὲν τὸ τῆς ὀρθῆς δόξης ἀπασίοντας κήρυγμα, καὶ τὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σκανδαλίζοντας ποίμνιον τῆς ἱερατικῆς αὐλῆς ἐξωσεράπευσεν.

[g] Leo, Epist. ad Constant. ibid. p. 1117, C. 9. Ὡσαύτως βδελυττόμεθα καὶ ἀναθεματίζομεν. . . . Μακάριον τὸν γενόμενον ἀκατιῶνα τῆς Ἀντιοχέων ἐκκλησίας ἅμα τῷ σὺν αὐτῷ τῆς πλάνης μαθητῇ, μᾶλλον δὲ διδασκάλῳ Στεφάνῳ· καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς Πολυχρόνιον, τὸν νέον ὡς ἀληθῶς Σίμωνα. (D. 9.) οὓς ἀποκήρυξεν ἡ περιμημονευομένη ἁγία καὶ οἰκουμενικὴ ἕκτη σύνοδος, καὶ τὸν Μακάριον μὲν τοῦ τῆς προεδρίας ἀξιώματος ἀπεβάλετο, τὸν δὲ μαθητὴν αὐτοῦ Στέφανον, καὶ Πολυχρόνιον τὸν μεμαγευμένον γέροντα τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἐξέκεψε τιμῆς· . . . καὶ ὑπὸ τὴν δορὰν τοῦ προβάτου λανθάνων ἐκαπφάνθη λύκος, καὶ ἀντὶ ποιμένος πύρϊθη κλέπτης, καὶ ληστὴς ἀπεβλήθη ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ τῶν προβάτων ποιμένος, τουτέστι τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Digitized by Google

wolves, and thieves, and robbers, who could not be admitted in the college of bishops, till some wonderful change was wrought in them. And is it possible to think, that men of this character, under all the disadvantages of heresy, excommunication, and deposition from their order, by the Trinity itself, should still be looked upon as true ministers of God; as still invested with a sufficient authority to perform any ministerial acts, by virtue of an original ordination implanting a power in them, that no power on earth could wholly take from them? If the power of the Church was not sufficient to deprive them of this pretended authority, yet sure the power of the Holy Trinity, the fountain of all spiritual authority and power, must be owned all-sufficient to take away the authority which it at first gave them. And then we have as full proof, that these Eutychian heretics were divested of their whole ministerial authority, as can possibly be given. Yet there is no order or decree, in this or any other Council, for rebaptizing such as were in due form baptized by these unauthorized heretics, but the contrary; for all the Eutychians are appointed to be received only by imposition of hands and confirmation.

## SECT. IX. — *How the Council of Trullo censured delinquent Bishops and Clerks.*

To what has been said of the six general Councils, I shall add the sense of the Council of Trullo, which is, as it were, but an appendix to the two last of them. For, because no canons of discipline were made in those two synods, this Council was called on purpose, an. 692, or, as Petavius computes, an. 707, under Justinian II., to supply the defects of the two former Councils; whence it had the name of *Quinisextum*, 'the fifth and sixth council together.' There are above thirty canons in this Council, which order bishops and clerks to be degraded, for several crimes there specially noted: but I shall only mention two or three, that are a little more remarkable. In the twenty-first canon,[h] some

[h] Conc. Trull. c. xxi. (Labbé, vol. vi. Conc. p. 1151.) Οἱ ἐπὶ ἐγκλήμασι πανοικῶς ὑπεύθυνοι γινόμενοι, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο παντελεῖ τι καὶ διηνεκεῖ καθαιρέσει ὑποβαλλόμενοι ἐν τῷ τῶν λαϊκῶν ἀπωθούμενοι τόπῳ, κ. τ. λ.

Digitized by Google

criminals are subjected to a total and perpetual deposition, and thrust down to the place and state of laymen, there to exercise themselves in repentance for ever, without hopes of restitution. In the twenty-second canon,[i] "If a bishop, or any other clerk, is simoniacally ordained for money, they that are ordained, and they that ordained them, are both ordered equally to be deposed." And in the next canon,[k] every clerk is subject to the same penalty that takes money for administering the communion, as guilty of a simoniacal error and wickedness. In the twenty-sixth canon,[l] a priest that marries unlawfully, though it be by ignorance, is allowed to retain the honour of his chair, but he must forbear all sacred offices: he must neither give the blessing publicly nor privately, nor distribute the body of Christ to others, nor do any other ministerial act. And a reason is given for all this, because such an one wants a cure for his own wounds, and the blessing of sanctification himself; and he cannot impart that to others which he himself wants; but he must weep out his sins before the Lord by a perpetual repentance.

Now upon these canons, I would ask these plain questions: Whether priests, totally degraded, and thrust down to the place of laymen, could be supposed, by this Council, to act, after this, as authorized ministers of Christ? Whether bishops or priests, deposed for simony, were still invested with the true rights and power of the ministerial function? Whether that which makes an ordination void as soon as it is given, as simony does, doth not likewise deprive a man of sacerdotal authority, when he is afterward found guilty of it, and legally deposed for it by the Church? And, Whether a man, who is lawfully forbidden, by the best authority in the

[i] Conc. Trull. c. xxii. Τοὺς ἐπὶ χρήμασι χειροτονουμένους, εἴτε ἐπισκόπους, εἴτε εἰουσδήποτε κληρικοὺς, καὶ οὐ κατὰ δοκιμασίαν καὶ τοῦ βίου αἵρεσιν, καθαιρεῖσθαι προστάσσομεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς χειροτονήσαντας. (P. 1154.)

[k] Ibid. c. xxiii. Εἰ δὲ φανείη τις τῶν ἐν κλήρῳ καταλεγομένων ἀπαιτῶν, ἢ μεταδίδωσι τῆς ἀχράντου κοινωνίας, τὸ εἰωθὸς εἶδος, καθαιρείσθω, ὡς τῆς Σίμωνος ζηλωτὴς πλάνης καὶ πανουργίας.

[l] Ibid. c. xxvi. D. 7. Μήτε δημοσίᾳ μήτε ἰδίᾳ εὐλογείτω, μήτε τὸ Κυρίου σῶμα διανεμέτω.

Digitized by Google

Church, to do any ministerial act whatsoever, can be said to perform those acts by the Church's authority, in opposition to her lawful commands? He that can reconcile these things by the help of two words, called *indelible character*, may enjoy his opinion, for me, without contradiction. I shall not think it worth while to dispute eternally with any one, who has such an infallible way of solving difficulties by hard names, or reconciling contradictions by some dark and unintelligible school-distinction. I hope I have plainly made it appear to all unprejudiced men, that there is no foundation for asserting, that heretics, and schismatics, and degraded priests, and priests cast out of the Church with anathema, are authorized ministers of the Church of Christ, from the history of the first six general councils. The consequence of which is, that the baptisms, given by such unauthorized persons, could not be valid by virtue of any true ministerial authority residing in such persons, who were really and truly divested of it; but they must be received by the Church upon some other principle, since it is certain she never allowed the ministerial authority of heretics, and yet received their proselytes by imposition of hands, without rebaptizing.

Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER II.

THE SAME ASSERTION PROVED FROM PATRIARCHAL, NATIONAL, AND PROVINCIAL COUNCILS; AND FROM THE WRITINGS OF PRIVATE FATHERS, WITH SEVERAL ARGUMENTS DRAWN FROM THEIR TESTIMONY. ARGUMENT I. — THAT SOME HERETICS, WHOSE BAPTISM WAS RECEIVED, NEVER HAD ORIGINALLY ANY REAL AND TRUE ORDINATION TO THE MINISTERIAL OFFICE AND FUNCTION: CONSEQUENTLY THEY COULD BE NO OTHER THAN UNAUTHORIZED PERSONS. THIS PARTICULARLY PROVED UPON THE NOVATIAN HERETICS.

SECT. I.—*A short Reference to such Patriarchal, National, and Provincial Councils, as agree with the forementioned General Councils.*

AFTER the history of the six general councils, it will be needless to trouble every ordinary reader with a particular account of every patriarchal, national, and provincial synod, upon this subject. And yet there is scarce one of these in all the tomes of the councils, where the same thing is not as plainly asserted. The learned and inquisitive reader, that will be at the same pains as I have been, may satisfy himself by having recourse to them: for whose ease I will here give him a short index or reference to such councils and canons as will give him satisfaction upon this subject. There are some provincial councils, which are taken into the code of the Church universal, and so are of the nature of general councils by their confirmation. Such are the Council of Ancyra, can. 1, 2, 10, 14; the Council of Neocæsarea, can. 1 and 8; the Council of Antioch, can. 1, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13. Others are large patriarchal councils, next to general ones. Such are the Council of Sardica, can. 1, 2, 4, 20; and the African Code, can. 11, 15, 25, 27, 28, 31, 71, 81. In citing which canons I follow the edition of Ehinger, Wittebergæ, 1614. To these may be added those which are called the Apostolical Canons, because they were

Digitized by Google

generally received in the Greek Church, can. 3, 6, 7, 8, 12, 20, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 35, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 68, 69, 70, 83. In all which canons, the sentence of deposition is pronounced against all such clerks, as were found guilty of the several crimes particularly specified in them. Other councils were only national or provincial; such as the Council of Eliberis, can. 51, 76. The first Council of Arles, can. 13, 22. The second Council of Arles, can. 14, 15. The first Council of Carthage, can. 2, 14. The Council of Aquileia, where Palladius, the Arian, was deposed by St. Ambrose. The Council of Colonia Agrippina, where Euphratas, bishop of Cologne, was deposed for Arianism. The fourth Council of Carthage, can. 48, 49, 50, 56, 57, 60, 68, 69. The Council of Turin, can. 2. The fifth Council of Carthage, can. 3, 11, 12, 13. The first Council of Toledo, can. 2, 4, 5. The Council of Milevis, can. 18, 19, 22, 25. The Council of Riez, Rhegiense, can. 1. The Council of Agde, can. 1, 9, 49, 50, 60. The first Council of Orange, can. 21. The Council of Rome, under Hilary, can. 3. The Council of Tarraco, can. 2, 10. The Council of Epone, can. 22. The Council of Lerida, can. 5, 12, 16. The Council of Valencia, in Spain, can. 3. The Council of Gironde, Gerunda, can. 11. The second Council of Toledo, can. 3. The second Council of Orleans, can. 4, 8, 9, 13. The third Council of Orleans, can. 2, 6, 7, 8, 15, 19, 26. The fourth Council of Orleans, can. 10, 17. The fifth Council of Orleans, can. 4, 10, 11. The fourth Council of Toledo, can. 30, 44. The first Council of Bracara, can. 32, 37. The eighth Council of Toledo, can. 3, 4, 7, 8.

In these canons there are almost a hundred particular crimes specified, for which bishops and clerks might be deposed from their office and function. What then? if such clerks should pretend to officiate after they were degraded, shall it be said, that such persons were still authorized ministers of Christ, when the Church, in the name of Christ, had unauthorized them, and, as some of them express it, unordained them? When the Church had cancelled their ministerial authority, had they still authority, in spite of the

Digitized by Google

Church's power, to act as lawful ministers of God? Or were all these canons made to no other purpose, but to shew how insignificant the Church's power and discipline was; and how much superior the *indelible character* of a priest was, which could maintain his authority, let the Church do what she would to deprive him of it? Whatever some men's notions may be of the priesthood, I question not, the generality of sober readers will have more honourable sentiments, than to think that a wicked, or impious and heretical priest cannot possibly do any thing to forfeit his authority, if he has but once had a regular ordination; or that the Church cannot justly deprive him of this authority, if he does such things as make him liable to a total and perpetual deprivation. This were such an affront to all these Councils and their authority, that I cannot think it needful to say any thing further to any wise man, to convince him of the unreasonableness and absurdity of such an assertion. Therefore, instead of being more particular in the history of these several councils, I will sum up the force of them, and other private writers, in some proper arguments, to shew, that all the baptisms which the Church anciently received, were not given by true authorized ministers; which, without any further inquiry, must infallibly put an end to the question about lay-baptism.

### SECT. II.—*The first Argument founded upon the Novatians' wanting a true Ordination.*

The first argument I shall draw from the ancient Councils and Fathers, to this purpose, is founded upon the Novatians' wanting a real and lawful ordination. That the Church received their baptisms, is a matter clear beyond all dispute, and I know my learned antagonists will not pretend to question it: but, that these Novatians had a lawful and true ordination is not so clear; but rather, from ancient history and rules, it is clear to the contrary. For Novatian himself, who was the father of the Novatians, was never ordained a true and lawful bishop, but only a bishop in pretence: therefore all such ministers as derived the original of their orders and authority from him, were only pretended

Digitized by Google

ministers, like their founder. I know the gentlemen with whom I now dispute, will not offer to deny this, supposing Novatian was no true bishop; but they will say that Novatian was a true bishop, because he had three bishops to ordain him. And, indeed, if the hands of three bishops was all that was necessary to the true ordination of a bishop, then it could not be denied that Novatian was a true bishop. But these gentlemen cannot be ignorant, that to a true ordination something else is required besides the hands of three bishops: there are some personal qualifications requisite in the party ordained, and many canonical prescriptions to be observed in making a true bishop; else his ordination is null and void, *ab origine*. For what, if three bishops should combine to ordain a child of three years old, as the popes have done some at seven; would such an imposition of hands pass for a true ordination? What, if three bishops should be wrought upon by simony to ordain a man, who had no manner of episcopal qualifications? What, if three bishops should first be made drunk with wine, and then forced, against all rules, and against their own wills, to lay hands on a vile wretch, who had not the least pretence to an ordination; would this be thought to give him the true power and authority of a bishop, or be looked upon as such in any part of the Catholic Church? What, if three bishops should illegally concur to ordain a man an anti-bishop into a full see, where another was legally ordained already, and in just and quiet possession of the Church; would this intruder be esteemed a true bishop in any part of the world but Utopia, because of such a pretended ordination? And yet this was, in a great measure, the case of Novatian. He had nothing beside his age to qualify him to be ordained a bishop, of all the particulars that have been mentioned.

SECT. III. — *That Novatian was never a true Bishop, proved first, because he had only a simoniacal and forced Ordination.*

For, first, his ordination was not only against his own oath, but simoniacal, and forced into the bargain. Some, indeed,

Digitized by Google

have said, that he was ordained only by Novatus, a priest: but that is a mistake; for it is owned he had three bishops to ordain him. But, then, their manner of proceeding was such as no rules could justify: the ordination which they gave him, was null from the very first: because these three bishops, being fetched from the furthest corner of Italy, had nothing to do to ordain Novatian a bishop at Rome, without a regular and synodical election. They were made to believe, before they came there, that they should have a synod of bishops to join with them: but when Novatian had got them into his possession, he set some of his party to make them drunk, and shut them up prisoners; and then, at four o'clock in the afternoon, he "compelled them by force to give him the bishoprick, by an imaginary, and delusive, and vain ordination,"[a] as Cornelius, the true bishop, words it in his epistle to Fabian, bishop of Antioch, where he gives him an account of the whole proceeding; rightly concluding that, by this wicked craft and treachery, he usurped a bishoprick, which did by no right belong to him. And, therefore, this episcopacy was only taken to himself by robbery: it was not given him from heaven.[b] Not long after, one of those three bishops, as Cornelius adds, returned to the Church, confessing and bewailing his crime: whom Cornelius, at the intercession of all the people, received into communion, but only as a layman, ἐκοινωνήσαμεν ὡς λαϊκῷ; and the other two he deposed, and ordained two successors in their room, and sent them to their respective places. This is also taken notice of by Cyprian,[c] who seems to say this penitent

[a] Euseb. lib. vi. c. xliii. p. 243, (p. 311, edit. Readingii.) (Vales. 1695, p. 198, C. 3.) Συγκλεισθέντας ὑπό τινων ὁμοίων αὐτῷ στεναγμένων ἀνθρώπων, ἄρρι δικάτῃ μεθύοντας καὶ κραιπαλῶντας, μετὰ βίας ἀνάγκασιν εἰσενεγκεῖν τινὶ καὶ μανταίῳ χειροτονίᾳ ἐπισκοπὴν αὐτῷ δοῦναι· ἣν ἐνίδρᾳ καὶ πανουργίᾳ, μὴ ἐπιβάλλουσαν αὐτῷ ἐκδικεῖ.

[b] Ibid. p. 243, (p. 311, edit. cit.) Παρασκεῦσθαί τι καὶ ὑφαρπάζειν τὴν μὴ δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ ἄνωθεν ἐπισκοπὴν ἐπιχείρει.

[c] Cyprian. Epist. lii. al. lv. ad Antonian. (Oxon. 1682, p. 105,) (p. 244, edit. Fell. Amstelod. 1700.) Tractatu cum collegis plurimis habito, susceptus est Trophimus; pro quo satisfaciebat fratrum reditus, et restituta multorum salus: sic tamen admissus est, ut laicus communicet, non secundum quod ad te malignorum litteræ pertulerunt, quasi locum sacerdotis usurpet.— Cyprian, in the same Epistle, p. 104, reflects upon Novatian for using force to get himself ordained: 'Vim fecit, ut episcopus fieret.'

Digitized by Google

bishop's name was Trophimus, who brought back with him a great multitude of people from the schism to the Church: which made his admission so much the easier, because he made some sort of satisfaction for his crime thereby: yet he was admitted only to communicate in the order of a layman, and not allowed any longer to retain the place of a priest. Nothing now can be plainer, than that, by this account, Novatian's pretended ordination did not make him a true bishop, nor give him episcopal authority to ordain others. For if one of his ordainers was, for his crime, degraded and made a layman; and the other two not allowed so much as the privilege of communicating laymen, but were wholly excommunicated and cast out of the Church; we cannot suppose that Novatian, who was the cause of all this, could have the least pretence to a true ordination, nor consequently any authority, as from heaven or the Church, to act as a bishop, and give others ordination. For not only Cornelius and Cyprian, who might be supposed to be parties against Novatian, but all the ancient canons, declare such sort of simoniacal, irregular, and forced ordinations to be void and null from the beginning. Which are things, I presume, so well known,[d] that I need not insist upon them.

SECT. IV.— *This proved further, because he intruded himself into a full See.*

But there was another reason, which utterly annulled the ordination of Novatian, and made him no true bishop; and that was, that, against all the laws of the Catholic Church, and rules of Catholic unity, he intruded himself into a full see, where another was regularly and divinely chosen before him. This is the argument so much insisted on by

[d] Can. Apost. c. xxix. (al. xxx.) (Labbé, vol. i. p. 29, c. xxviii.) Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος διὰ χρημάτων τῆς ἀξίας ταύτης ἐγκρατὴς γένηται, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, καθαιρείσθω καὶ αὐτὸς, καὶ ὁ χειροτονήσας, καὶ ἐκκοπτέσθω παντάπασιν τῆς κοινωνίας, ὡς Σίμων ὁ Μάγος ἀπὸ [ὑπ'] ἐμοῦ Πέτρου.——Conc. Chalced. c. ii. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 755.) Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἐπὶ χρήμασι χειροτονίαν ποιήσαιτο, καὶ εἰς πράσιν καταγάγῃ τὴν ἄπρατον χάριν, καὶ χειροτονήσῃ ἐπὶ χρήμασιν ἐπίσκοπον· . . . ὁ τοῦτο ἐπιχειρήσας, ἐλεγχθείς, πιπτέτω τὸν οἰκεῖον κινδυνεύοντα βαθμόν· καὶ ὁ χειροτονούμενος μηδὲν ἐκ τῆς κατ' ἐμπορίαν ὠφελείσθω χειροτονίας ἢ προβολῆς, ἀλλ' ἔστω ἀλλότριος τῆς ἀξίας, ἧς ἐπὶ χρήμασιν ἔτυχεν· κ. τ. λ.

Digitized by Google

Cyprian in particular, to prove him no true bishop. Thus in the forecited Epistle to Antonian, speaking of the difference between the ordinations of Cornelius and Novatian, he freely, after this manner, gives his judgment of them both: "Cornelius," says he,[e] "was made bishop by the approbation and judgment of God and Christ; by the testimony of almost all the clergy, and the suffrage of all the people that were present, and the college of ancient and good bishops; when no one had been ordained before him, when the place of Fabian, that is, when the place of Peter, and the episcopal chair, was empty. Which being once filled according to the will of God, and confirmed by all our consent and approbation; whoever after that is minded to be made bishop, is a foreigner and an alien; he has not the ordination of the Church, who holds not the unity of the Church; whoever he be, or whatever he boasts or assumes to himself, he is a profaner, an alien, a foreigner. There cannot be a second bishop after the first: therefore, whoever is made a bishop after the first, which ought to be singly done, he is not a second bishop, but none at all." It is impossible to express in plainer words, that Novatian was not a true bishop, though he had three bishops to give him a theatrical and delusory ordination. Cyprian,[f] a little after, in the same Epistle, joins both these arguments together, to prove him to be no bishop, because he was simoniacally

[e] Cyprian. Epist. lii. al. lv. ad Antonian. (Oxon. 1682, p. 104,) (p. 243, edit. Amstelod.) Factus est Cornelius episcopus de Dei et Christi ejus judicio, de clericorum pene omnium testimonio, de plebis quæ tunc adfuit suffragio, et de sacerdotum antiquorum et bonorum virorum collegio; quum nemo ante se factus esset, quum Fabiani locus, id est, quum locus Petri et gradus cathedræ sacerdotalis vacaret. Quo occupato de Dei voluntate, atque omnium nostrum consensione firmato; quisquis jam episcopus fieri voluerit, foris fiat necesse est; nec habeat ecclesiasticam ordinationem, qui ecclesiæ non tenet unitatem; quisquis ille fuerit, multum de se licet jactans, . . . profanus est, alienus est, foris est. Et quum post primum secundus esse non possit, quisquis post unum, qui solus esse debet, factus est, non jam secundus, ille sed nullus est.

[f] Ibid. (Oxon. p. 112,) (p. 249, edit. Amstelod.) Quod post connexam et ubique conjunctam Catholicæ ecclesiæ unitatem, humanam conetur ecclesiam facere, et per plurimas civitates novos apostolos suos mittat, ut quædam recentia institutionis suæ fundamenta constituat: cumque jam pridem per omnes provincias et per urbes singulas ordinati sint episcopi in ætate antiqui, in fide integri, in pressura probati, in persequutione proscripti, ille super eos creare alios pseudo-episcopos audeat.

Digitized by Google

ordained, and because he was an adulterous and extraneous bishop, made after another had been ordained in the Church by sixteen fellow-bishops: and, therefore, he charges him with setting up a human Church, instead of a Divine, and sending new apostles into every city, to maintain the foundations of his new institution. In short, all these were false bishops, because they were superordained, by one who himself had no power, over other bishops that had before been regularly ordained in every city and province, and who, both for their age, and faith, and fortitude in sufferings and persecution, were without exception. Cyprian often repeats and inculcates this argument in his other Epistles,[g] "That there could not be another bishop, after the first was legally made; that he was an adulterous bishop and a contrary head;[h] not in the Church, but out of it, since he was ordained against the rule of the Divine institution and Catholic unity, only by the prevalency of a faction:" with much more to the same purpose,[i] which, after such plain testimonies, I need not cite at length to satisfy a judicious reader. But, that this may not seem to be the private opinion only of Cyprian or Cornelius, as persons who wrote out of prejudice to Novatian, I will shew it to be agreeable to the general and standing rule of the Catholic Church, that a man is no bishop, who is superordained over another bishop, into a full see, which the other is legally and divinely possessed of. This was the ground upon which the Council of Aquileia[k] pronounced Valens, the Arian, to be

[g] Cyprian. Epist. xli. al. xliv. ad Cornel. (Oxon. p. 86,) (p. 230, edit. Amstelod.) Episcopo semel facto, et collegarum ac plebis testimonio et judicio comprobato, alium constitui nullo modo posse.

[h] Ibid. Epist. xlii. al. xlv. ad Cornel. p. 86, (p. 230, edit. cit.) Contra sacramentum semel traditum Divinæ dispositionis et Catholicæ unitatis, adulterum et contrarium caput extra ecclesiam fecit.

[i] Cyprian. Epist. xliv. al. xlvi. ad Maxim. et Nicostrat. (Oxon. p. 89,) (p. 232.) Gravat me atque contristat . . quum vos illic comperissem, contra ecclesiasticam dispositionem, contra evangelicam legem, contra institutionis Catholicæ unitatem, alium episcopum fieri consensisse, id est, quod nec fas est, nec licet fieri, ecclesiam aliam constitui; &c.

[k] Conc. Aquilei. Epist. Synod. ad Gratian. et Theodos. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 995, A. 10.) Qui episcopus esse nec cœpit. Nam primo Petavione superpositus fuerat sancto viro Marco admirabilis memoriæ sacerdos [sacerdoti]: &c.

Digitized by Google

no bishop, because he was superordained at Petavio, while Marcus, the true bishop, was living. Upon this ground the ordination of Majorinus, the first father of the Donatists, was reckoned null, because he was superordained a pretended bishop at Carthage, when the see was legally filled before by Cæcilian. For this made the schism, and "set up altar against altar; and therefore the ordination of Majorinus was unlawful," as Optatus words it.[l] This was one reason why the Council of Nice disannulled the ordinations of those bishops, whom Meletius had schismatically superordained in Egypt, when the sees were filled with Catholic bishops before: this he did to strengthen his party; but the Council decreed all these should be reordained, before they were admitted to serve in the Catholic Church: as we have heard before in the history of that Council.

The next general Council of Constantinople, upon the same ground, declared Maximus, the cynic, to be no bishop, though he had seven bishops to ordain him, because his ordination was only a superordination into a full see, of which Gregory Nazianzen was legally possessed before; and they not only annulled his ordination, but all those that were ordained by him: as I have shewed in the last chapter, from the fifth canon of that Council. For the same reason all the bishops in the world, who defended the Council of Chalcedon, declared unanimously in their answers to Leo, the emperor, upon the case of Timotheus Ælurus, the pretended bishop of Alexandria, who had gotten himself first superordained into the see of Proterius, and, shortly after, by his faction, murdered him,—they declared, I say, "This Timotheus not only to be no bishop, but to be deprived of the name of a Christian;" as Liberatus[m] informs us from the Synodical Epistles, that were then, from several parts of the world, sent to the emperor upon it. Some of these are yet remaining at the end of the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon,

[l] Optat. lib. i. p. 42, Antuerp. 1702. Sic exitum est foras, et altare contra altare erectum est, et ordinatio illicite celebrata est.

[m] Liberat. Breviar. c. xv. (Labbé, vol. v. p. 764, D. 3.) Rescribunt, Timotheum non solum inter episcopos non haberi, sed etiam Christiana appellatione privari.

Digitized by Google

one or two of which it will not be amiss here to transcribe. In the Synodical Epistle of the bishops of Phœnicia Secunda to the emperor, they thus express themselves concerning this Timotheus,[n] "That he was a wicked tyrant, and by no means ever made a bishop, but was only an adulterous invader of the Church; one who, by the blood of the true bishop, was minded to settle himself in the Church, which Christ redeemed with his own blood: one that was no shepherd of Christ's flock, but an insupportable wolf; not a father, but a parricide" or murderer of his father (meaning the true bishop), "not a bridegroom, but a usurper of the marriage-chamber. Such an one, they declare, they could not call a bishop." In another of these Synodical Epistles,[o] from the bishops of Helenopontus, which the printed copies read corruptly, Hellespontus, a great many reasons are given why the ordination of this Timotheus never made him a true bishop; because he was, in the first place, actually deposed from the office of presbyter, by his own bishop, Proterius, and an Egyptian synod: then again he had but two bishops to ordain him, which was not a canonical number: and further, these two were under the same sentence of deposition with himself; and lastly, this wicked ordination was made while Proterius, the true bishop, was living, and actually performing the duties of the episcopal function. Such intruders as these, therefore, were only wolves or adulterers, and not true shepherds or bishops, in the language of the ancient councils. Some councils[p] peremptorily forbid all

[n] Epist. Synod. Phœniciæ Secundæ ad Leon. Imperat. ad calcem Conc. Chalced. part. iii. c. xxxviii. (Labbé, vol. iv. p. 922, B. 10.) De impia tyrannide Timothei Ægyptii, qua usus est, sacerdos equidem factus non est, sed potius ecclesiæ adulter apparuit. Quid dicam, qui eam, quam Salvator proprio sanguine liberavit, ille pontificali sanguine voluit adipisci; et factus est non pastor ovium Christi, sed importabilis lupus; non pater, sed parricida; non sponsus, sed thalami violator? . . . se eum nequaquam vocare sacerdotem.

[o] Ibid. c. liii. (p. 962, C. 13.) Neque is qui ab eis ordinatus est, sacerdotium poterit obtinere, vel si regulariter provenisset, quando etiam is qui dicitur ordinatus, damnatus erat a sanctissimæ memoriæ episcopo suo Proterio, et concilio sanctorum episcoporum Ægyptiacæ diœceseos, quique a duobus solummodo similiter secum condemnatis, et neque numerum ordinantium complentibus regularem, nefandam ordinationem dicitur suscepisse, vivo pontifice, et ea quæ sunt sacerdotii celebrante.

[p] Conc. Aurel. V. c. xii. (Labbé, vol. v. p. 394.) Nulli viventi episcopo

Digitized by Google

such superordinations, or superposition of one bishop over another, except it be in the place of one who is legally deposed for some capital crime. And other councils declare[q] all such superordained usurpers to be wolves, and not bishops; no, nor "to deserve the name of bishops," as the great Council of Sardica speaks in this behalf, concerning Gregory, who was intruded into Alexandria in the room of Athanasius; and Basil, of Ancyra, in the room of Marcellus; and Quinti[*li*]anus, of Gaza, in the place of Asclepas. So that it is as evident as words or authorities can make it, that, according to the rules and discipline of the ancient Church, not only in the Cyprianic age, but in the following ages also, the ordination of a man into a full see, legally possessed and occupied by another, was a null ordination from the beginning; and such an one was not a bishop, but an unauthorized intruder, a wolf, an adulterer, an alien and foreigner, and no priest in the eye of the Catholic Church. Whence it follows, that Novatian, being one of this sort, had no pretence to the name or authority of a bishop; and, consequently, all such as were ordained by him either bishops or priests, to strengthen his faction, were in no better condition: for they could have no more authority than they derived from him, which was really none at all, if there be any weight in the account that has now been given of his ordination. And yet the baptisms of these Novatians were, by order of several general councils, received, as given in due form, in the name of the Trinity, though by persons who, upon many

alius superponatur aut superordinetur episcopus, nisi forsitan in ejus locum, quem capitalis culpa dejecerit.

[q] Conc. Sardic. Epist. Synod. apud Hilar. in Fragmentis, p. 128, (See Labbé, vol. ii. p. 91.) Illos autem, qui se eorum ecclesiis immerserunt luporum more, id est, Gregorium in Alexandria, Basilium in Ancyra, et Quintilianum in Gaza, neque nomen habere episcopi, neque communionis omnium eorum habere participatum. —— Theod. Hist. lib. ii. c. viii. (p. 79, edit. Readingii Cantab. 1720,) (Vales. 1695, p. 79, D. 9.) Τοὺς δὲ εἰς τὰς ἐκκλησίας αὐτῶν ἐπιλθόντας δίκην λύκων, Γρηγόριον τὸν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ, Βασίλειον τὸν ἐν Ἀγκύρᾳ, καὶ Κυντιανὸν τὸν ἐν Γάζῃ, τούτους μηδὲ ἐπισκόπους ὀνομάζειν μηδὲ Χριστιανούς, μηδὲ ὅλως κοινωνίαν τινὰ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἔχειν, μηδὲ δίχεσθαί τινα παρ' αὐτῶν γράμματα, μήτε γράφειν πρὸς αὐτούς. —— Athanas. Apol. ii. p. 167, (edit. Paris. 1698.) Where the same words are to be found.



Digitized by Google

accounts, had no ministerial authority to give them. I hope, now, my learned friend, Dr. Brett, will own this is home to the point, that the Church received the baptisms of such heretics as administered it in due form, though they never had a real, but only a pretended ordination. If he asks, Why, then, the Council of Nice did not order the Novatian bishops and priests to be reordained? I answer, some learned men think she did make such an order in her eighth canon, which appoints them 'to be received among the Catholic clergy by imposition of hands,' χειροθετουμένους αὐτοὺς μένειν οὕτως ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ. But I am not sure that imposition of hands, in that place, means the imposition of hands used in ordination. If the doctor thinks it does, he has his answer. But one thing I am sure of, that without a reconciliatory imposition of hands, to unite them to the Church, the Novatians had no authority to act as lawful ministers of the Church; and whether the Church gave them a new ordination or not, she certainly gave them the authority of a new commission, which they had not, nor could have before, whilst they were involved in such a schism, as could afford them no real, but only pretended ordinations. But, forasmuch as the outward form of ordination was given them in pretence, though without any competent authority in the ordainers, the Church perhaps might have her reasons to omit the outward ceremony, and supply what was deficient in their ordination, by adding her own authentic commission and authority upon their reconcilement to the Church. But whether it was one way or other, we are assured in fact, they were never truly and authentically ordained in their schism, because they had no real, but only a pretended ordination, given them by persons who, by the rules of the Church, had no authority to give it.

Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER III.

ARGUMENT II. — THAT HERETICS ARE NOT AUTHORIZED MINISTERS OF GOD; BECAUSE, WHEN THEY FALL INTO OPEN AND PROFESSED HERESY, THEY CEASE TO BE TRUE CHRISTIAN PRIESTS, AND BECOME WOLVES AND ANTI-CHRISTS, INSTEAD OF TRUE SHEPHERDS AND GOVERNORS OF THE FLOCK OF CHRIST.

SECT. I. — *That a lawful Ordination does not secure a Man in the Possession of a perpetual authorized Priesthood, unless he observe the Rules of the Priesthood.*

HAVING thus far shewed, that some heretics were not true authoritative ministers of God, because they never had a just and proper call, or ordination to the priesthood; I will now, to gratify my learned adversary's hypothesis, suppose with them, not granting it, that all the ancient heretics had a true and lawful ordination: yet I assert, that it does not hence follow, that they were true authorized priests of God. For the priests of God are bound to walk by certain rules, which are necessary to preserve their authority; and, unless they observe those rules, they forfeit their authority: and it is not merely the privilege of a lawful ordination that can secure them in the perpetual possession of an authorized priesthood, if they do such things as unqualify them for the ministry of the Gospel. There are, it may be, near a hundred several crimes, specified in those ancient canons, to which I have referred the reader in the beginning of the last chapter, for which a priest, who had received a lawful ordination, might be finally degraded and deposed, and thereby forfeit all the right and title he could pretend to have, to act with authority in any part of the ministerial functions. And, among these crimes, heresy was always reckoned the chief, because it struck at the very foundation of religion; that is to say, the faith which was once delivered to the saints. Therefore, a priest, once plainly convicted of open and professed heresy, was no longer deemed a true and

Digitized by Google

lawful priest, or allowed to act with the authority of a minister in the Church. The very people were bound, in conscience, to fly from such for their own security: for they were wolves, and not shepherds; antichrists, and not true ministers of Christ.

SECT. II.—*This proved from Cyprian, who declares Heretics to forfeit both the Name and Authority of Priests.*

A man cannot look into the writings of St. Cyprian, but he will see this almost in every page of him: for he always opposes the priests of God and heretics as diametrically contrary to one another; styling the latter, adulterers, impious, sacrilegious usurpers, who set up a priesthood only of human invention, contrary to the Divine and evangelical institution; and assumed to themselves such powers as did by no right belong to them. Thus, in one of his epistles to his people at Carthage,[a] he complains of the five schismatics who joined with Felicissimus, that they left the priests of the Lord, and set up a new sacrilegious institution against the discipline of the Gospel. A little after, he says,[b] "There was but one Church, and one chair, founded by Christ himself, in the person of Peter. And another altar could not be erected, nor a new priesthood invented, beside the one altar and the one priesthood that was already settled. Whosoever gathers elsewhere, he scatters abroad. Whatever priesthood is set up by human fury, to the violation of the Divine institution, is adulterous, impious, sacrilegious. Therefore depart from the contagion of these men, and avoid their preaching as a cancer and a plague." Could he that said thus much of schismatics, think heretics to be

[a] Cyprian. Epist. xl. al. xliii. ad Pleb. (Oxon. p. 82,) (p. 228, edit. Fell. Amstelod. 1700.) Sed relictis Domini sacerdotibus contra evangelicam disciplinam nova traditio sacrilegæ institutionis exsurgat.

[b] Ibid. (Oxon. p. 83,) (p. 229, edit. Amstelod.) Deus unus est, et Christus unus, et una ecclesia, et cathedra una super Petrum Domini voce fundata. Aliud altare constitui, aut sacerdotium novum fieri, præter unum altare et unum sacerdotium, non potest. Quisquis alibi collegerit, spargit. Adulterum est, impium est, sacrilegum est, quodcumque humano furore instituitur, ut dispositio Divina violetur. Procul ab hujusmodi hominum contagione discedite, et sermones eorum velut cancer et pestem fugiendo vitate, &c.

Digitized by Google

priests of God, who are so much worse than schismatics, by how much they strike more directly at the foundation? Though they were regularly ordained at first, yet, according to Cyprian, their heresy or schism destroys their title; and their succession becomes only a human institution, which cannot make priests without God's appointing. Therefore he calls all such as are ordained by heretics,[c] "False bishops and false priests; adversaries of the Lord and antichrists;[d] rebels and enemies, for receding from charity and the unity of the Church; and worse than heathens and publicans, for setting up false altars and illegal priesthoods, and sacrilegious sacrifices, and adulterated names." In short, he denies all such to be priests:[e] "They are the enemies of priests: they only usurp other men's offices, which by no right belong to them." Therefore the Council of Carthage, under Cyprian,[f] determined that all such pretended priests lost what they received before, by virtue of a legal ordination; and all such as were ordained by them, upon their return to the Church, were only to be received as laymen.[g] I know my opponents will not pretend to deny this to have been the opinion of Cyprian and the whole Council of Carthage. Nay, they will readily join Firmilian

[c] Cyprian. Epist. lv. al. lix. ad Cornel. (Oxon. p. 132,) (p. 263.) Fortunatum istum sibi pseudo-episcopum dignum collegio suo fecit. Venerat etiam cum illo et Felix quidam, quem ipse extra ecclesiam in hæresi, pseudo-episcopum olim constituerat.

[d] Ibid. Epist. lxxvi. al. lxix. ad Magnum, (Oxon. p. 180,) (p. m. 294.) Unde apparet adversarios Domini et antichristos omnes esse, quos constet a caritate atque ab unitate ecclesiæ Catholicæ recessisse. . . . Si autem qui ecclesiam contemnunt, ethnici et publicani habentur; multo magis utique rebelles et hostes, falsa altaria, et illicita sacerdotia, et sacrificia sacrilega, et nomina adulterata fingentes, inter ethnicos et publicanos necesse est computentur; quando minora peccantes, et tantum ecclesiæ contemtores, ethnici et publicani sententia Domini judicentur.

[e] Ibid. (Oxon. p. 184,) (p. m. 297.) Quomodo tales justificare et sanctificare baptizatos possunt; qui hostes sacerdotum, aliena et illicita, et nullo sibi jure concessa, usurpare conantur?

[f] Conc. Carth. apud Cyprian. n. lxx. (p. 240.) Homo hæreticus dare non potest, quod non habet; multo magis schismaticus, qui quod habuit, amisit.

[g] Ibid. n. iv. p. 231, (p. m. 159.) Eos qui ordinati videbantur, inter laicos recipi.

Digitized by Google

and St. Basil to them. For they know St. Basil says, Cyprian and Firmilian pleaded for the rebaptization of such as were baptized by heretics and schismatics, upon this principle, that heretics were not priests, and, therefore, had no authority to baptize, or ordain, or absolve, or perform any other office of the sacerdotal function. They could not, then, think there was any such virtue in the indelible character of a priest, as to preserve his sacerdotal authority entire in him, after he was turned heretic or schismatic, or was legally degraded by the Church. Thus far, therefore, we seem to be agreed. But then they will say, If Cyprian's principle was true, why should not his consequences be received also; that those who are baptized by heretics, and those who are baptized by laymen (both which are priests of the same authority, that is, none at all), should be rebaptized? I answer, Because wiser judges than either they, or I, or even Cyprian himself, that is, the general Councils and Fathers of the Catholic Church, have determined otherwise. And, therefore, our question, at present, is not, Whether heretics were to be rebaptized (for that is determined already beyond contradiction); but only, Whether heretics acted with the true authority of priests, when they baptized others, in the opinion of Cyprian and the Catholic Church. That they did not act as true authorized priests in the opinion of Cyprian, is already cleared, and granted by my opponents also. So that all I have now to do, is to shew the same of the Fathers and Councils of the Church in after-ages.

### SECT. III. — *From the Council of Aquileia, under St. Ambrose* (*an.* 381).

And here we have the testimony of St. Ambrose and a whole council of Italian bishops, who met at Aquileia to depose Palladius and Secundianus, two Arian bishops (an. 381), the same year that the Macedonians, and Apollinarians, and Maximus, the cynic, were deposed in the general Council of Constantinople. Now this Council, in their Synodical Epistle to the Emperors Valentinian and Gratian, acquainting them with their proceedings against those Arian

Digitized by Google

bishops, tell them they had abdicated them from the priesthood:[h] for it was not fit that they should lay any claim to be priests under Him, whose Divinity they had denied. In the Acts of the Synod, every bishop pronounces his particular sentence against them. St. Ambrose and Valerian in these words:[i] "I judge Palladius an alien from the [college, or] society of priests." Justus, in these words:[k] "I think Palladius can no longer be called a priest, nor be reckoned among bishops." Theodorus, of Octodorus:[l] "I judge him by no means to be either a priest or a Christian." These bishops had not such an opinion of the indelible character of a priest, whatever there may be in it, as to think that an Arian heretic had any longer the authority of a priest of Christ, whose Divinity he denied: but they thought he might be abdicated from the priesthood; and therefore they deprived him of it, that he might no longer, under the name of a priest, deceive the people.

## SECT. IV. — *From the Council of Colonia Agrippina (an. 346).*

About the year 346, another council was held at Colonia Agrippina, by the famous Servatius Tungrensis, and several other bishops, against Euphratas, bishop of Cologne, whom they likewise deposed for maintaining the Arian heresy. The form of his deposition runs much in the same terms, as in the Council of Aquileia. Maximinus Treverensis, who presided in the Council,[m] declares it "manifest that he

[h] Conc. Aquil. ep. Synod. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 994, D. 4.) Arianos ne ulterius populos deciperent, sacerdotio putavimus abdicandos. Neque enim dignum est, ut sacerdotium ejus sibi vindicent, quem negaverunt.

[i] Ibid. p. 989, B. 6. Palladium pronuntio sacerdotio indignum et carendum. . . . Hujusmodi hominem a consortio sacerdotum censeo esse alienum.

[k] Ibid. Palladium censeo ulterius sacerdotem dici non posse, nec inter episcopos deputari.

[l] Ibid. p. 990. Palladium nec Christianum, nec sacerdotem ullo modo censemus.

[m] Conc. Agripp. apud Crabb. tom. i. p. 317, (Labbé, vol. ii. pp. 615–617.) Episcopum eum manifestum est esse non posse. Severinus: 'Consentio eumdem, juxta evangelica præcepta, jure ab episcopatu esse dejectum.' Servatius: 'Censeo Christianis episcopum eum esse non posse, quia Deum Christum sacrilega voce

Digitized by Google

cannot be a bishop." Others say, "He is legally deposed from his episcopacy by the rules of the Gospel." Servatius speaks more expressly: "That he cannot be a Christian bishop, who, with a sacrilegious mouth, denies Christ to be God." Valentinus, bishop of Arles, said, "He could be no bishop, who, for denying Christ to be God, had not so much as right to lay-communion." The same is said in the Acts of Servatius, which are added by Crabb at the end of the Acts of this Synod:[n] "That it was his opinion, that if this Euphratas was allowed to do penance, it should not be as a bishop, but rather as a layman." To which all the rest of the bishops consenting, immediately thereupon, Euphratas, in their style, is said to be 'unordained,' or to have his ordination cancelled; which appears to be done by degrading him to the order of laymen.

### SECT. V.—*From an Italic Council, under St. Ambrose (an. 381).*

Such another sentence was passed upon the Apollinarian heretics, in an Italic Council under St. Ambrose (an. 381). Whether this was the forementioned Council of Aquileia, or Milan, or some other, is not certain. For all that Labbé could find of it, is only two Synodical Epistles to Theodosius, the emperor; in the first of which there is this decree mentioned, as made against the Apollinarians in that Council:[o] "That if any priest was convict of that new heresy, he should lose both the office and name of a priest, as having lost that which makes priests, that is, the magistery of Catholic doctrine." What can be plainer than the evidence given in these Councils against heretics having any pretence to

negavit.' Valentinus: 'Quia Euphrata Christum Deum negat, consentio eum episcopum esse non posse, qui nec laicam debet communionem accipere.'

[n] Acta Servatii, apud Crabb. tom. i. p. 318. Cujus (Euphratæ) et penitentia si qua est exspectanda, potius hanc sentio inter laicos, quam inter episcopos, agendam.—Nulla mora, singulis pontificibus orationes similes ad eamdem normam dictantibus, Euphrata deordinatur.

[o] Conc. Ital. Epist. i. ad Theod. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 1006, E.) Ut convictus in dogmate novo, et redargutus in errore, nequaquam sub generali fidei lateret nomine: sed illico, quod doctrinæ magisterio non teneret, et officium deponeret et vocabulum sacerdotis.

Digitized by Google

sacerdotal authority after their deposition? They may be less than laymen; for they may be anathematized and cast out of the Church: but more than laymen they cannot be, although they repent and be restored to the communion of the Church; so long as they are divested both of the name and office of priests, which was the usual punishment of heretics, according to the sentence and decrees of these ancient councils.

### SECT. VI.—*From the Roman Council of ninety Bishops under Damasus* (*an.* 369).

Such another council was held under Damasus, at Rome (an. 369), where ninety bishops met to condemn Auxentius, and other Arian bishops. In their Synodical Epistle to the bishops of Illyricum, which is both in Theodoret and Sozomen,[p] and the tomes of the councils,[q] they threaten to deprive them of their communion and the very name of bishops. Which certainly implies, that they thought they had power to take away the authority of priests from them, since they would not leave them so much as the very name remaining.

### SECT. VII.—*From the Testimony of Domnus, Bishop of Antioch, and John Cassian.*

And as they thus treated heretics, so did they also Catholic priests, who committed crimes worthy of deposition, if they continued obstinate in them. Thus Liberatus observes concerning the proceedings of Domnus, bishop of Antioch, with the presbyters and deacons of Edessa, who came to accuse Ibas, their bishop, before him. Ibas had excommunicated them for pretending to make information against him. From this unjust excommunication Domnus, the patriarch, ordered them to be absolved; but yet upon

[p] Theodoret. lib. ii. c. xxii. (Vales. 1695, p. 104, A. 7.) Πιστεύομεν δὲ οὐκ εἰς μακρὰν τοὺς ἄλλα νοοῦντας αὐτῇ τῇ ἐπιχειρήσει ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμετέρας κοινωνίας χωρισθήσεσθαι, καὶ περιαιρεθήσεσθαι ἀπ' αὐτῶν τὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου ὄνομα.——Sozomen (lib. vi. c. xxiii.) has the same words.

[q] Conc. Roman. Ep. Synod. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 890, C.) Pro certo credimus, eos qui alia opinione tenentur irretiti, propter suum conatum brevi fore et a nostra segregatos communione, et nomine episcoporum privatos, &c.

Digitized by Google

this condition,[r] "That if they stirred a foot out of Antioch before the festival of Ascension, which was then at hand, they should be deposed from their orders." It seems this patriarch had no other notion of the orders of a priest or deacon, but that if they did things unworthy of their order, they might have their orders taken from them; and it was not the pretence of an indelible character that could secure the authority or name of priests to them, against the authority of their patriarch, who presumed he had a legal power to depose them from their orders. And that this was the standing rule of the Church of Antioch, is further evident from what Cassian says upon occasion of Nestorius's turning heretic. Nestorius was born, and bred, and baptized, and ordained at Antioch; and it was the profession of his faith, according to the Antiochian creed, which made him both a Christian and a priest: but when he once had lost this faith, Cassian says,[s] "He then lost all that he gained by his faith: for the sacrament [or mystery] of his priesthood, and of his salvation too, depended both equally upon the truth of his creed." So that he forfeited his priesthood, as much as he did his salvation, when he turned heretic, and apostatized from the faith in which he had been baptized.

### SECT. VIII.—*And Pope Innocent.*

In the Church of Rome they never received any one as a priest who was brought to do public penance: and for this reason, those that were ordained by heretics, were reckoned no priests among them, to the time of Pope Innocent, who says,[t] "Where penance was necessary," as it was in receiving

[r] Liberat. Breviar. c. x. (Labbé, vol. v. p. 754, B. 7.) Qui quum adscendissent Antiochiam, eos Ibas excommunicavit. Sed superveniente festivitate Quadragesimæ Adscensionis, jussi sunt a Domno excommunicatione absolvi, sub ea conditione, ut Antiochiam non exirent, alioquin a suo deponerentur ordine.

[s] Cassian. de Incarnat. lib. vi. p. 1274. Perdens symboli fidem, totum quod fueras, perdidisti: sacramenta enim sacerdotii ac salutis tuæ symboli veritate constabant. (Lips. 1733, p. 749.)

[t] Innocent. Epist. xxii. ad Episc. Macedon. c. iii. (tom. ii. Conc. p. 1274.) Ubi pœnitentiæ remedium necessarium est, illic ordinationis honorem locum habere non posse decernimus. Sed e contrario adseritur, eum qui honorem

Digitized by Google

such as were ordained by heretics, "there the honour of ordination could have no place." But, on the contrary, they maintained, that he that had lost his honour, could not give the honour of the priesthood; nor could one, ordained by heretics, receive any thing, because the giver had nothing in him to give. Therefore, it was the custom of the Roman Church, to receive those that came over from heretics only to lay-communion by imposition of hands, but not to allow them the least honour of the clergy.[u] For though this was dispensed with in some extraordinary cases of necessity, in some other Churches, yet he says it never prevailed at Rome. Whence it is evident, they thought that neither they that lapsed into heresy, nor they that were ordained by heretics, had any title to the honour of the priesthood.

### SECT. IX. — *And Pope Simplicius.*

Simplicius, bishop of Rome, had the same opinion of delinquent clerks, that they might lose the authority of the priesthood. For writing to John, bishop of Ravenna, who had ordained some clerks against their will, he tells him,[v] "That for this he deserved to lose his privilege, for abusing the power that was committed to him. And if he peristed contumacious in this practice, the power of ordination should be wholly taken from him." In another epistle to Florentius,[w] Equitius, and Severus, three Italian bishops, he has occasion to censure one Gaudentius, bishop of Aufinium, for ordaining against the canons: for which crime he declares him

amisit, honorem dare non posse: nec illum aliquid accepisse, quia nihil in dante erat, quod ille posset accipere.

[u] Innocent. Epist. xxii. ad Episc. Macedon. c. iv. (tom. ii. Conc. p. 1274.) Venientibus ab hæreticis, qui tamen illic baptizati sint, per manus impositionem laicam tantum tribuere communionem, nec ex his aliquem in clericatus honorem vel exiguum subrogare.

[v] Simplic. Epist. ii. ad Joan. Raven. (Labbé, vol. iv. p. 1069, A. 6.) Privilegium meretur amittere, qui permissa sibi abutitur potestate. . . Denuntiamus autem, quod si posthac quidquam tale præsumseris, et aliquem seu episcopum, seu presbyterum, seu diaconum, invitum facere forte credideris, ordinationes tibi Ravennatis ecclesiæ vel Æmiliensis noveris auferendas.

[w] Ibid. Epist. iii. ad Florent. apud Crabb. tom. i. p. 957, (Labbé, vol. iv. p. 1069.) Relatio nos instruxit Gaudentium, Aufiniensis ecclesiæ sacerdotem,

Digitized by Google

"deprived of all power of ordaining for the future, and those that were ordained illegally by him, to be deposed." Could it then be said, that these bishops had still authority to ordain, when all power and authority of ordaining was wholly taken from them? Or, that those priests who were illegally ordained by them, were true authorized priests, that were deposed as soon as they were ordained, and never allowed to exercise any part of the ministerial function? We see no difference here made between those that once had a true ordination and those that had not: for when they were once totally deposed, they were all equally deprived of the power and authority of the priesthood.

### SECT. X.—*And Pope Vigilius.*

Pope Vigilius is as peremptory as his predecessors, that a synod of bishops has power to take away all ministerial office and power from a delinquent bishop or clerk: and by virtue hereof he himself, with a synod of bishops, deprived Theodore, bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, declaring him[x] "divested and despoiled, as well of sacerdotal honour and Catholic communion, as of all episcopal office and power; and that henceforth he had nothing to do but to weep out his sins by repentance." They that made canons in this style against heretics and other criminal clerks, could not possibly think they were authorized priests, after such legal and formal depositions, which took from them both the office, and the name, and the power, and authority, of the priesthood. But it will still be said over and over again, by those against whom I dispute, that "these were not mere laymen:" by which if they mean men that never had any sort of ordination at all, either real or pretended, I grant they were not, nor could be, mere laymen: for it were an absurd contradiction to say, that they had received an ordination, and yet never had one. But the thing I assert is this, that

contra statuta canonum ac nostra præcepta, ordinationes illicitas perpetrasse, quarum illi totam penitus auferri præcipimus potestatem. . . . ut hi qui illicite ab eodem sunt provecti, ab ecclesiasticis ministeriis sint remoti.

[x] Fragment. Depositionis Theodori per Vigil. apud Crabb. tom. ii. p. 8. Tam sacerdotali honore et communione Catholica, quam omni officio episcopali seu potestate spoliatum esse.

Digitized by Google

a man who had a true ordination, if for heresy, or any other crime, he was legally deposed, he had no longer the Divine power of an authorized priest; because the same Divine authority which gave him his authority by ordination, by deordination takes it away from him; and save that it cannot be said he never had an ordination, in all other respects he was a layman, and all his pretended ministerial offices were of no more authority or effect, than those of a layman, because he was wholly divested of all clerical authority; and either reduced to a state and communion of laymen, if penitent; or else, if he remained contumacious and impenitent, he was set one degree below laymen, that is, totally excommunicated and cast out of the Church. Of which points of discipline, toward heretics and delinquent clerks in the ancient Church, I have given some hints already: and shall now more fully demonstrate the truth of them in the two following chapters.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

ARGUMENT III.—THAT HERETICS AND DEGRADED CLERKS WERE NOT AUTHORIZED PRIESTS IN THE ACCOUNT OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH, BECAUSE, BY HER DISCIPLINE, THEY WERE REDUCED TO THE STATE AND COMMUNION OF LAYMEN.

### SECT. I.—*No Persons, who were obliged to do Public Penance, allowed to be of the Clergy.*

As a further proof of the position at first laid down, that heretics and degraded clerks could not act with the authority of priests, but only as laics, in the ministration of baptism, or any other sacred office, I here observe, that by the censures of the Church they were reduced to the state, and name, and communion, of laymen. And this upon supposition only that they were penitent, and submitted to the Church's discipline; for otherwise they were anathematized with the greater excommunication, and not allowed the benefit even of lay-communion in the Church. Lay-communion, then,

Digitized by Google

was a privilege allowed to heretics and degraded clerks upon their repentance; but more than this was not ordinarily granted them. If any man, for any scandalous crimes, was obliged to do public penance, this cut him off from clerical communion ever after, by the strict discipline which continued for several ages in the Church. Upon this account, as I have observed and proved in another place,[p] from many testimonies of Siricius, Innocentius, Gennadius, the second Council of Arles, the Council of Agde, the first Council of Toledo, the fourth Council of Carthage, the Council of Gerunda, Optatus, and St. Austin, if any had done public penance in the Church, for any scandalous crime, that very thing did for ever, according to the rules and discipline of those times, render that person incapable of holy orders: or, if he was ordained by mistake, as soon as the thing came to be known, he was deposed by a rule of the fourth Council of Carthage (can. 68), for not declaring that he had been a penitent, at the time of his ordination. So, in like manner, any clerk, who had received a just and canonical ordination, if after that he lapsed into any crimes that required him to do public penance, as heresy, idolatry, murder, adultery, and many the like, was thereby utterly excluded from all clerical communion, and reduced as entirely to lay-communion, as any one that had at first been irregularly ordained.

### SECT. II. — *All Degraded Persons reduced, at least, to Lay-Communion.*

Nor was it only public penitents among the clergy that were thus treated, but likewise all others that were totally degraded for any crimes whatsoever. Though they were excused doing public penance, because they thought a single punishment of degradation was sufficient for such crimes; yet they were still debarred all clerical communion, and only treated as laymen for ever after in the Church. This is so evident to all that are acquainted with ancient history, that I would not spend time to prove it, were not the gentlemen

[p] Origin. Eccles. Vol. i. Book iv. chap. iii. sect. vi.

Digitized by Google

I am dealing with, so rigid as to exact superabundant proofs from Fathers and Councils, for every thing I have asserted against them. Let us see, then, for their satisfaction, what evidence there is, that heretics and degraded clerks, whether subjected to public penance or not, were all reduced to the state of lay-communion.

### SECT. III.—*This proved from Cyprian and his Contemporaries, Cornelius, and the Council of Carthage.*

I begin with the testimony of Cyprian, and his contemporaries, Cornelius, bishop of Rome, and the fathers assembled, under Cyprian, in the Council of Carthage. We have had something of Cyprian's judgment about this matter before, upon the case of Trophimus,[b] one of the three bishops that ordained Novatian; who, upon his acknowledgment of his error, was admitted into the Church again, yet not allowed to take upon him the office of a priest, but only to communicate in the quality of a layman.[c] And so Cornelius, speaking of the same person, says,[d] "He received him into communion only as a layman:" which does not mean, that he was only like a layman, but that he was now a layman, and not a priest; as Cyprian more distinctly expresses it. In another epistle, Cyprian, with a whole synod of African bishops, considers the case of Basilides and Martial, two Spanish bishops, who had lapsed into idolatry in time of persecution:[e] "These men, at first," he says, "deposed themselves voluntarily for their crimes, and desired only to be admitted to penance, and thought it favour enough to be admitted to communion as laymen. But afterward they repented of their repentance, and would have been admitted again as bishops; which would by no means be allowed them:

[b] See before, chap. ii. sect. iii. p. 236.

[c] Cyprian. Epist. lii. al. lv. ad Anton. (Oxon. p. 106,) (p. 244, edit. Amstelod.) Sic tamen admissus est Trophimus, ut laicus communicet, non . . . quasi locum sacerdotis usurpet.

[d] Cornel. Epist. ad Fabium, apud Euseb. lib. vi. c. xliii. (p. 198, C. 10.) ᾧ ἐκοινωνήσαμεν ὡς λαϊκῷ.

[e] Cyprian. Epist. lxviii. al. lxvii. ad Fratr. Hispan. (Oxon. p. 173,) (p. m. 289.) Episcopatum pro conscientiæ suæ vulnere sponte deponens, ad agendam pœnitentiam conversus sit, Deum deprecans, et satis gratulans, si sibi vel laico communicare contingeret.

Digitized by Google

for such men did but in vain attempt to be bishops,[f] "Since it was a clear case, that they ought not to preside over the Church of Christ, or offer sacrifice to God: especially when it had been so decreed, not only by the African synods, but by Cornelius at Rome, and all the bishops of the whole world, that such men might be admitted to penance indeed, but never more lay any claim to the order of the clergy, or the honour of the priesthood." Here, I think, if ever, there was universal consent of all the bishops in the world upon the point in debate: they all decreed to a man, that a bishop or priest, that was justly deposed for idolatry, was no longer an authorized bishop or priest, nor to be reckoned of the order of the clergy, but to be treated only as a layman. I challenge the world to give a plainer proof of universal consent in this case; and if the opposers of the validity of lay-baptism, and defenders of rebaptization, will produce as authentic a testimony of universal consent for their thesis, I will promise, in point of history, to subscribe to their opinion.

But I go on with Cyprian, who, in another epistle to Pope Stephen, says,[g] "It was agreed upon, by common authority and consent, that if any presbyters or deacons, who were first ordained in the Catholic Church, did afterward turn traitors and rebels against the Church; or any

[f] Cyprian. Epist. lxviii. al. lxvii. ad Fratr. Hispan. (Oxon. p. 174,) (p. m. 290.) Frustra tales episcopatum sibi usurpare conantur, quum manifestum sit ejusmodi homines nec ecclesiæ Christi posse præesse, nec Deo sacrificia offerre debere. Maxime quum jam pridem nobiscum et cum omnibus omnino episcopis in toto mundo constitutis, etiam Cornelius, collega noster, sacerdos pacificus ac justus, et martyrio quoque dignatione Domini honoratus, decreverit ejusmodi homines ad pœnitentiam quidem agendam posse admitti; ab ordinatione autem cleri atque sacerdotali honore prohiberi.

[g] Ibid. Epist. lxx. ad Stephan. (Oxon. 1682, p. 197,) (p. m. 305.) Addimus plane et adjungimus consensu et auctoritate communi, ut si qui presbyteri aut diaconi, qui vel in ecclesia Catholica prius ordinati fuerint, et postmodum perfidi ac rebelles contra ecclesiam steterint, vel apud hæreticos a pseudo-episcopis et antichristis contra Christi dispositionem profana ordinatione promoti sint, et contra altare unum atque Divinum, sacrificia foris falsa ac sacrilega offerre conati sint; eos quoque hac conditione suscipi quum revertuntur, ut communicent laici, et satis habeant quod admittuntur ad pacem, qui hostes pacis exstiterint, nec debere eos revertentes ea apud nos ordinationis et honoris arma retinere, quibus contra nos rebellaverint.

Digitized by Google

others that were promoted among heretics, by the profane ordination of false bishops and antichrists, against the rule of Christ, did take upon them to offer false and sacrilegious sacrifice out of the Church, in opposition to the one altar of God; that neither of these, upon their return to the Church, should be received upon any other condition but this, that they should be laymen, and communicate only as such; and account it enough to be admitted to the Church's peace, who had been the enemies of peace; but not be allowed to retain the armour of their ordination and honour, with which they had fought against her." It is impossible to say in plainer words, that heretics and degraded clerks are not priests, but only laymen; or that such as are ordained by heretics, who are only false bishops and antichrists, are only laymen, and to be treated as laymen, upon their return to the Church. I shall but mention one place more in Cyprian, which relates the case of one Fortunatianus, an African bishop of Assuræ, who had lapsed either into idolatry or the Novatian schism, for which he was deposed, but afterward would have acted as a bishop again. Whom Cyprian, therefore, violently opposed, writing to the Church of Assuræ, and telling them[h] "how much he was offended, that Fortunatianus, this quondam bishop, should, after his fall and ruin, attempt to be restored to his office, and act as a bishop again; and when he ought only to give himself up to prayers and tears, day and night, to implore God's mercy, and make satisfaction for his offence, he still presumed to lay claim to the priesthood, which he had betrayed; as if it was lawful for a man to minister at the altar of God, who before had stood at the altar of the devil." This evidently goes upon the same principle, that a bishop, once deposed for idolatry or heresy, was never after to be reputed a bishop, or to meddle with any part of the epi-

[h] Cyprian. Epist. lxix. al. lxv. ad Pleb. Assuritan. (p. 162,) (p. m. 282.) Graviter et dolenter motus sum, quod cognoverim Fortunatianum, quondam apud vos episcopum, post gravem lapsum ruinæ suæ, pro integro nunc agere velle, et episcopatum vindicare cœpisse: et (quum debeat satisfacere, et ad Dominum exorandum, diebus ac noctibus, lacrimis, et orationibus, et precibus, incumbere), audet sibi adhuc sacerdotium quod prodidit, vindicare; quasi post aras diaboli accedere ad altare Dei fas sit.



Digitized by Google

scopal office, but to do penance for his crimes, in order to be received to communion as a layman. And upon this principle, it was asserted in the council under Cyprian,[i] that as heretics and schismatics were to be rebaptized, so all that were ordained by them, were only to be received as laymen. And, indeed, upon this very principle, if St. Basil says true,[k] both Cyprian and Firmilian required heretics and schismatics to be rebaptized, because their baptism was no other than the baptism of laymen. So that they must needs suppose that heretics and schismatics were only laymen; else the foundation of their argument had been faulty. And though they drew a wrong conclusion from that principle, which the Church, in after-ages, by her general councils, corrected; yet she never denied their principle, but acted still in conformity to it, reducing heretics, and schismatics, and degraded clerks, to lay-communion, except where some intervening necessity and extraordinary occasion required her to relax her discipline, as in the case of the Novatians and Donatists, and some few others, in order to make up the Church's peace, and put an end to an inveterate schism. Of which I shall make full proof in pursuing the subsequent practice of the universal Church; by which it will evidently appear, that the ordinary way of treating heretics, and schismatics, and degraded clerks, was, according to the Cyprianic age, to reduce them still to lay-communion.

### Sect. IV. — *And from the Apostolical Canons.*

This appears, first, from those canons which go under the name of the Apostolical Canons, if we allow those to be of later date than Cyprian. For in two of those rules there is this direction. In the fifteenth canon it is ordered, that if any clerk run from his own diocese to another, and refuse

[i] Conc. Carth. apud Cyprian. n. iv. p. 231, (p. m. 159.) Novatus a Thamugade dixit, 'Omnes schismaticos et hæreticos, qui ad ecclesiam conversi sunt, baptizari; sed et eos qui ordinati videbantur, inter laicos recipi.'

[k] Basil. c. i. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 1717, E. 4.) Οἱ δὲ ἀποῤῥαγέντες, λαϊκοὶ γινόμενοι, οὔτε τοῦ βαπτίζειν, οὔτε τοῦ χειροτονεῖν ἔχουσι τὴν ἐξουσίαν, οὐκέτι δυνάμεως χάριν Πνεύματος ἁγίου ἐπέρχεσθαι, ἧς αὐτοὶ ἐκπεπτώκασι. Διὸ, ὡς παρὰ λαϊκῶν βαπτιζομένους τοὺς παρ' αὐτῶν, ἐκέλευσαν ἐρχομένους ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τῷ ἀληθινῷ βαπτίσματι τῷ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀναπαθαίρεσθαι.

Digitized by Google

to return again at the command of his own bishop, he shall be degraded from his ministry, and only be allowed 'to communicate as a layman,' ὡς λαϊκὸς κοινωνείτω. And in the sixty-second canon it is said, "If any clerk, through human fear of a Jew, or Greek, or heretic, denies himself to be a clerk, he shall be deposed; and upon his repentance 'be admitted to communicate only as a layman,'" ὡς λαϊκὸς δεχθήτω. By which any one may judge, "that being deposed from the ministry," and "being made a layman," are words of the same importance, according to the sense of those ancient canons.—See also can. ix. al. xii.

### SECT. V.—*And the Council of Eliberis.*

We have the same rule in the ancient Council of Eliberis, which orders,[1] "That if a deacon suffered himself to be ordained, when he was conscious to himself of having committed a mortal sin; if he confessed it voluntary himself, he should be admitted to communion after three years' penance; but if another detected him, he should do penance for five years, and then only be admitted to lay-communion."

### SECT. VI.—*And the Council of Sardica.*

Such another canon we have in the great Council of Sardica, where the case of two faulty bishops, Musæus and Eutychian, was examined, and a decree to this purpose made upon it:[m] "That neither of them should thenceforth assume to themselves the name of bishops, nor be esteemed as such: but if they desired lay-communion, it should not be denied them."

[1] Conc. Illiber. c. lxxvi. (Labbé, vol. i. p. 978.) Si quis diaconum se permiserit ordinari, et postea fuerit detectus in crimine mortis, quod aliquando commiserit; si sponte fuerit confessus, placuit eum, acta legitima pœnitentia, post triennium accipere communionem. Quod si alius detexerit, post quinquennium, acta pœnitentia, accipere communionem laicam debere.

[m] Conc. Sardic. c. xix. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 641, E.) Εὐτυχιανὸν δὲ μήτε ἐπισκόπου ἑαυτῷ διεκδικεῖν ὄνομα· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Μουσαῖον ὡς ἐπίσκοπον νομίζεσθαι· εἰ δὲ λαϊκὴν κοινωνίαν ἀπαιτοῖεν, μὴ κρῆναι αὐτοῖς ἀρνεῖσθαι.

Digitized by Google

### SECT. VII. — *And the Council of Agde.*

A like decree was made in the Council of Agde, for the French Churches; where it is ordered,[n] "That if a bishop, presbyter, or deacon, committed a capital crime, or falsified a deed, or gave a false witness, he should be deposed from the honour of his office, and be thrust into a monastery, and there, as long as he lived, have only the privilege of lay-communion."

### SECT. VIII. — *And the Council of Orleans.*

The third Council of Orleans has two canons to the same purpose. The first concerns the clergy, from bishops down to subdeacons, who are forbidden to cohabit with their wives, under pain of being deposed from their office, according to the decrees of former canons, and[o] "being reduced to lay-communion." The other forbids all the same orders of the clergy to exercise usury, under the same penalty, threatening, that if any one presume to transgress their decrees,[p] "He shall be degraded from his order, and only be admitted to communion;" that is, to lay-communion: for no other communion can here be meant, since he was excluded from clerical communion by his degradation.

### SECT. IX. — *The First Council of Toledo.*

The first Council of Toledo has such another canon about subdeacons:[q] "That if any of them marry a third wife, he shall be excommunicated for two years; and then being reconciled by penance, be admitted to communicate only as a layman." And in the next canon, a presbyter or a deacon

[n] Conc. Agath. c. 1. (Labbé, vol. iv. p. 1391.) Si episcopus, presbyter, aut diaconus, capitale crimen commiserit, aut chartam falsaverit, aut testimonium falsum dixerit, ab officii honore depositus in monasterio retrudatur, et ibi quamdiu vixerit, laicam tantummodo communionem accipiat.

[o] Conc. Aurel. III. c. ii. (Labbé, vol. v. p. 296.) Quod si fecerit, laica communione contentus, juxta priorum canonum statuta, ab officio deponatur.

[p] Ibid. c. xxvii. (Labbé, vol. v. p. 302.) Si quis adversum statuta venire præsumserit, communione concessa ab ordine regradetur.

[q] Conc. Tolet. I. c. iv. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 1224.) Qui tertiam uxorem acceperit, abstentus biennio, postea inter laicos, reconciliatus per pœnitentiam, communicet.

Digitized by Google

neglecting the daily sacrifice, is no longer to be reputed a clerk,[r] if, after he is reprimanded by the bishop for his fault, he refuses to ask pardon and make satisfaction.

SECT. X.— *The Council of Hippo and St. Austin.*

The Council of Hippo, in Africa, made the same order about the Donatists,[s] "That they should only be received in the number of laymen." And though this rule was afterward dispensed with, for the sake of peace, and to put an end to the inveterate schism of the Donatists, yet St. Austin plainly tells us, that in strictness of discipline this would not have been allowed with any other view but only that of peace. For he thus answers the objection of the Donatists, who pertly demanded of him, "How it came to pass, that if it was necessary, in order to salvation, for a Donatist to repent of his being out of the Church and against the Church, notwithstanding this the Donatist clergy and bishops were suffered to continue in their station after their repentance?" To this he replies,[t] "That this would not have

[r] Conc. Tolet. c. v. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 1224.) Presbyter, vel diaconus, vel subdiaconus . . . si ad ecclesiam ad sacrificium quotidianum non accesserit, clericus non habeatur, si castigatus per satisfactionem veniam ab episcopo noluerit promereri.

[s] Conc. Hippon. c. xli. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 1181.) Ut Donatistæ in numero laicorum recipiantur.

[t] Aug. Epist. l. ad Bonifac. p. 87, (p. 227, A. tom. ii. opp. edit. Basil. 1569.) (Bened. 1700, vol. ii. p. 502, E. 6.) Si oportet, ut nos extra ecclesiam et adversus ecclesiam fuisse pœniteat, ut salvi esse possimus, quomodo post istam pœnitentiam apud vos clerici, vel etiam episcopi permanemus? Hoc non fieret, quoniam revera (quod fatendum est) fieri non deberet, nisi pacis ipsius compensatione sanaretur. Sed sibi hoc dicant, et multo maxime humiliter doleant, qui in tanta morte præcisionis jacent, ut isto quodam vulnere matris Catholicæ reviviscant. (P. 503.) Ut enim constitueretur in ecclesia, ne quisquam post alicujus criminis pœnitentiam clericatum accipiat, vel ad clericatum redeat, vel in clericatu maneat, non desperatione indulgentiæ, sed rigore factum est disciplinæ: alioquin contra claves datas ecclesiæ disputabitur, de quibus dictum est, 'Quæ solveritis in terra, soluta erunt et in cœlo.' Sed ne forsitan etiam detectis criminibus, spe honoris ecclesiastici animus intumescens superbe ageret pœnitentiam, severissime placuit, ut post actam de crimine damnabili pœnitentiam, nemo sit clericus, ut desperatione temporalis altitudinis medicina major et verior esset humilitatis. . . . Verum in hujusmodi causis, ubi per graves dissensionum scissuras non hujus aut illius hominis est periculum, sed populorum strages jacent, detrahendum est aliquid severitati, ut majoribus malis sanandis caritas sincera subveniat.

Digitized by Google

been allowed, because, in truth, it ought not to have been allowed; but only that the consideration of peace makes some compensation and atonement for it. Therefore the Donatists ought rather to turn this objection against themselves, and grieve the more humbly and heartily, that they lie in such a death of schism, as that nothing can revive them but making such a wound in the discipline of their Catholic mother. For this was the ordinary rule of the Church, that no one, after he had done penance for any crime, should either be promoted to the office of a clerk, or return to his office, or continue in his office: which was done, not to make men despair of pardon, but to keep up discipline in its just rigour and strictness. Otherwise we should dispute against the power of the keys committed to the Church; of which it is said, 'Whatsoever ye loose upon earth, shall be loosed in heaven.' But, lest men should proudly repent of their crimes, in hopes of an ecclesiastical promotion, this severity was wisely agreed upon; that after a man had done penance for any damnable crime, he should not be made a clerk, that, by despairing of temporal promotion, the medicine of humility might work a more sincere and effectual cure in him. But in such cases as these, when, by reason of great dissentions and schisms, it was not one or two single persons that were in danger, but whole multitudes that lay prostrate and slain; then something was to be abated of the strict severity of discipline, that charity might come in to assist in the cure of greater evils."

I have transcribed this whole passage of St. Austin, to shew both what was the ordinary strictness of the Church's discipline in this case, and what those reasons were that sometime obliged her to alter her measures upon extraordinary occasions. By which it appears, that, notwithstanding such dispensations upon great exigencies, her ordinary and standing method was to reduce heretics, and schismatics, and other delinquent clerks, to the state and communion of laymen.

Digitized by Google

SECT. XI.—*The Decrees of Pope Innocent.*

For the practice of the Church of Rome we have the testimony of Pope Innocent, who was contemporary with St. Austin. For we have heard him declare before (in the last chapter, sect. viii.), that it was the constant custom of the Roman Church to receive those that came over from heretics, only to lay-communion by imposition of hands, but not to allow them the least honour of clerical promotion.

SECT. XII.—*And Siricius.*

Pope Siricius mentions the same discipline, as exercised upon all such clerks as had, against canon, either married a widow, or a second wife:[u] "They were to be deprived of all ecclesiastical dignity, and only admitted to lay-communion." And St. Jerome says the same of heretical bishops, in his Dialogue against the Luciferians (cap. vii.).

SECT. XIII.—*And St. Basil.*

Among the canons of St. Basil, there is one to the same purpose,[w] "That such clerks as committed mortal sin, should be degraded or deposed from their order, but be still allowed to communicate as laymen: because, except in some special cases, a clerk was not to be punished doubly for the same fault;" that is, both by deposition and excommunication.

SECT. XIV.—*And the Council of Trullo.*

All this is confirmed by a canon of the Council of Trullo, which says,[x] when delinquent clerks are degraded by a complete and perpetual deposition, they are then "thrust down

[u] Siric. Epist. i. ad Himerium Tarracon. c. xi. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 1021.) Quisquis sane clericus aut viduam aut certe secundam conjugem duxerit, omni ecclesiasticæ dignitatis privilegio mox nudetur, laica sibi tantum communione concessa.

[w] Basil. c. xxxii. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 1740.) Οἱ τὴν πρὸς θάνατον ἁμαρτίαν ἁμαρτάνοντες κληρικοὶ, τοῦ βαθμοῦ μὲν κατάγονται, τῆς κοινωνίας δὲ τῶν λαϊκῶν, οὐκ ἐξέργονται. Οὐ γὰρ ἐκδικήσεις δὶς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό.

[x] Conc. Trull. c. xxi. (Labbé, vol. vi. p. 1151.) Οἱ ἐπὶ ἐγκλήμασι πανοικῶς ὑπεύθυνοι γινόμενοι, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο παντελεῖ τι καὶ διηνεκεῖ καθαιρέσει ὑποβαλλόμενοι, ἐν τῷ τῶν λαϊκῶν ἀπωθούμενοι τόπῳ.

Digitized by Google

to the place of laymen." So that we have as good proof of the discipline of the Church upon this head, as need be required.

Now, then, upon the whole matter, let any impartial man judge of the sense and practice of the ancient Church, in reference to the admission of such baptisms, as were given in due form by unauthorized laymen. If the Church had no other opinion of heretics, and schismatics, and degraded clerks, but as of unauthorized laymen; and yet admitted the baptisms of all such so far, as not to repeat them again by rebaptization; does it not plainly follow, that she admitted the baptisms of those who, in her opinion, were only unauthorized laymen? If any one says, they were reduced to lay-communion, but yet were authorized priests, and not laymen; he must first answer Cyprian, and all the other bishops of the world, who say, in the plainest terms, that they are not priests, but laymen; not like laymen, but really so. And then he must shew, likewise, how a man can be said to have the authority of a priest, when God and Christ, and the best authority in the Church, have taken away his authority from him. And when this is done, there will remain another difficulty behind, how a man can be said to be an authorized priest, who is not a complete and perfect layman: as no heretic, or schismatic, or degraded clerk, after they are anathematized for their obstinacy, can be said to be: for they are then not only reduced to the communion of laymen, but sunk one degree below laymen, by being excommunicate, or cast out of the Church. For no man is a complete layman, but he that is in full communion with the Church; which heretics, and schismatics, and degraded clerks, are not, after excommunication is once added to their deprivation, as it sometimes was, when they persisted obstinate and contumacious against the discipline of the Church: of which I shall give a more distinct and full account in the following chapter.

Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER V.

ARGUMENT IV. — THAT HERETICS, AND SCHISMATICS, AND DEGRADED CLERKS, WERE NOT ACCOUNTED AUTHORIZED PRIESTS, BECAUSE THEY WERE SOMETIMES THRUST DOWN ONE DEGREE BELOW LAYMEN, BY BEING ANATHEMATIZED AND CAST OUT OF THE COMMUNION OF THE CHURCH.

### SECT. I. — *That no Man is reckoned a complete Layman, but he that is in full Communion with the Church.*

ALL that has been said in the last chapter of heretics, and schismatics, and degraded clerks, being reduced to the communion of laymen, goes upon supposition of their being penitent, and that they quietly submitted to the Church's discipline, when they were corrected for their faults: for in that case the Church, in her punishments, shewed them some favour, when they did not add obstinacy and rebellion to their other crimes. She thought it enough to punish ordinary crimes in penitent clerks by the single punishment of degradation from their orders, and reduction of them to lay-communion, and did not proceed to the utmost severity of excommunication with them; unless for some higher crimes of a more malignant nature, or unless they proved refractory and contumacious against her censures. There are some ancient canons which give particular direction about this matter, that a delinquent clerk should not be punished twice for the same fault in ordinary cases; that is, he should not both be degraded and cast out of lay-communion also.[a] But, then, this was upon supposition, that he submitted quietly to the Church's censure, and that his crimes also were not of such a nature as to require a more severe judgment and condemnation. For otherwise both these punishments might be inflicted on him: he might

[a] Can. Apost. c. xxv. al. xviii. (Labbé, vol. i. p. 29, c. xxiv.) Ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ, ἢ ἐπιορκίᾳ, ἢ κλοπῇ ἁλούς, καθαιρείσθω, καὶ μὴ ἀφοριζέσθω· λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή· Οὐκ ἐκδικήσεις δὶς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐν θλίψει. Ὁμοίως δὲ [ὡσαύτως καὶ] οἱ λοιποὶ κληρικοί. — Basil. Ep. c. xxii. See before, note (ʷ), p. 263.

Digitized by Google

not only be deprived of clerical communion, but of lay-communion also; and at the same time that he was cast out of orders, be cast out of the Church, and be cut off entirely from all communion whatsoever. And this was sinking him one degree below a layman: for no man was accounted a complete layman but he that was in full communion with the Church, and had a right to participate with the faithful in all holy offices, and particularly the holy eucharist, or oblation, which was τὸ τέλειον, 'the consummation of all,' and that which made a man a perfect and complete Christian. For without this, a man was only an imperfect Christian, and in an incomplete state, and scarce to be reckoned of as a perfect and proper member of the Church. Upon this account, all catechumens were reckoned but imperfect members of the Church, though they had in a large sense the name of Christians; because, while they remained unbaptized, they had no right to the full communion of the faithful. In like manner, all excommunicate persons were at most but incomplete Christians, by being cut off from the communion of the Church: they were but a sort of dead members, till they revived again by repentance, and were restored by virtue of the right which baptism gives them, to be admitted to communion again upon confession and satisfaction. And in this state, all such heretics, and schismatics, and degraded clerks, were supposed to be, who underwent a double punishment, and had excommunication added to their deposition. They were by this means shut out of the Church, and denied the privilege even of lay-communion: so that they were not so much as complete and perfect laymen, but one degree lower than laymen, having lost their present right to full communion, and retaining little more besides their baptism to entitle them to the name of Christians. It is not easy to conceive, then, how they should be esteemed true authorized priests by the Church, whom she herself excluded from the privilege of true, complete Christian laymen.

Digitized by Google

SECT. II. — *Heretics, and Schismatics, and degraded Clerks, sometimes denied also the Privilege of Lay-Communion.*

But now that the Church did many times exercise this double censure, and inflict both the punishment of deposition and excommunication upon them, will be no hard matter to be made appear. For, not to mention now, how often heretics are laid under anathema by the six general councils, of which I have given a full account in the first chapter of this Book; nor how unanimously all the ancients declare all heretics and schismatics to be out of the true and perfect communion of the holy Catholic Church; nor how often heretics are said to be no Christians, no Church, no members of the Church, meaning thereby Christians in the adequate sense, and persons in full communion with the Church; I say, not to insist upon any thing of this, at present, it will be sufficient to shew, that heretics, and schismatics, and degraded clerks, were sometimes, after their deposition, also formally excommunicated by the Church, and denied even the communion of laymen.

SECT. III. — *This proved from the Testimony of Cyprian.*

This is evident from what Cyprian says of Evaristus, one of the three bishops that pretended to ordain Novatian,[b] "That for his crime he was so far degraded, as of a bishop not to be suffered to continue in the state and quality of a layman: he was not only deprived of his people and his see, but wholly banished the Church; because he continued obstinate in his schism, and did not, as Trophimus had done, submit himself by confession and penance, that he might be received to communion as a layman." This was the difference the Church then made between these two criminal bishops, who were concerned in the ordination of Novatian: they were both deposed from their order, and reckoned no bishops: but the one was received into church-communion,

[b] Cyprian. Epist. xlix. al. lii. ad Corn. (Oxon. 1682, p. 96,) (p. 237, edit. Amstelod.) Didicimus, et docere atque instruere ceteros cœpimus, Evaristum de episcopo jam nec laicum remansisse, cathedræ et plebis extorrem, et de ecclesia Christi exsulem.

Digitized by Google

upon his repentance, as a layman; whilst the other was wholly cast out of the Church for his impenitency, and not allowed to enjoy either the honourable title or communion of a layman. He was now less than a layman, who a little before was a bishop in the Catholic Church.

### SECT. IV.—*And the Apostolical Canons.*

Among the Apostolical Canons there are some which forbid a clerk to be punished doubly for the same crime in all ordinary cases, as has been observed before; yet there are two cases specified, in which excommunication is to be added to deposition. The first is the case of simony: which was a crime of that high nature, that if any bishop, presbyter, or deacon, was found guilty of it, "both he that was ordained, and he that ordained him, were not only to be degraded, but to be cut off entirely from all church-communion whatsoever,"[c] as Simon Magus was by Peter. The other case was much of the same nature:[d] "If any bishop made use of the secular power" (by which learned men understand the heathen magistrate) "to obtain a church, and thereby gets possession of it, he shall be both deposed and excommunicated also." There was no favour for such men: they must be ejected, not only from clerical communion and dignity, but from the common privilege and communion of laymen.

### SECT. V.—*The Council of Cologne.*

This was the censure that was passed upon Euphratas, the Arian bishop of Cologne, who, because he would not recant his heresy, was deposed in the Council of Cologne (an. 349). There every bishop gives his particular vote against him, and one of them thus expresses his condemnation:[e] "I

[c] Can. Apost. c. xxii. al. xxx. (Labbé, vol. i. p. 29, c. xxviii.) Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος διὰ χρημάτων τῆς ἀξίας ταύτης ἐγκρατὴς γένηται, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, καθαιρείσθω καὶ αὐτὸς, καὶ ὁ χειροτονήσας, καὶ ἐκκοπτέσθω τῆς κοινωνίας, παντάπασιν ὡς Σίμων ὁ Μάγος ἀπὸ [ὑπ'] ἐμοῦ Πέτρου.

[d] Ibid. c. xxiii. al. xxxi. (Labbé, vol. i. p. 31.) Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος κοσμικοῖς ἄρχουσι χρησάμενος, δι' αὐτῶν ἐγκρατὴς γένηται ἐκκλησίας, καθαιρείσθω, καὶ ἀφοριζέσθω.

[e] Conc. Agrippin. in Sententia Valentini apud Crabb. tom. i. p. 317. Consentio

Digitized by Google

agree to the determination of the synod, that Euphratas neither can be a bishop, nor ought to receive the communion of laymen."

## SECT. VI.— *The Council of Sardica.*

The Council of Sardica has two very remarkable canons upon this subject, pronounced by the mouth of the famous Hosius, bishop of Corduba, who presided in this synod. The first is made against such bishops as, through covetousness or ambition, without any legal or synodical call, removed themselves from one see to another, from a less city to a greater: to correct which exorbitancy with a just severity, it is there decreed,[f] "That such bishops ought not to have so much as the communion of laymen." And again, in a second canon,[g] "If any such bishop plead that he was called by the vote of the people, that being found to be only a pretence, such an one should not be admitted to lay-communion, not even at the hour of death." These fathers surely could not take those for authorized bishops, whom they laid under such a terrible anathema, that they did not think them worthy of the Church's peace *in extremis*, but denied them the common *viaticum* of laymen at their last hour.

## SECT. VII.— *The Council of Eliberis.*

The Council of Eliberis has such another canon concerning deacons, that suffered themselves to be ordained, when they knew themselves guilty of some mortal sin, that if it had been detected beforehand, would have hindered their ordination:[h] "If such an one confesses his fault voluntarily, then, after three years' penance, he might be admitted to

Euphratam episcopum esse non posse, qui nec laicam debet communionem accipere.

[f] Conc. Sardic. c. i. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 628, C. 9.) Ἠγοῦμαι, μηδὲ λαϊκῶν ἴχνη τοὺς τοιούτους χρῆναι κοινωνίαν.

[g] Ibid. c. ii. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 628, E. 7.) Τὰς ῥᾳδιουργίας τὰς τοιαύτας καὶ τίχνας κολαστέας εἶναι νομίζω, ὥστε μηδένα τοιοῦτον μηδὲ ἐν τῷ τέλει λαϊκῆς γοῦν ἀξιοῦσθαι κοινωνίας.

[h] Conc. Illiber. c. lxxvi. (Labbé, vol. i. p. 978.) Si sponte fuerit confessus, placuit eum, acta legitim pœnitentia, post triennium accipere communionem. Quod si alius eum detexerit, post quinquennium, acta pœnitentia, accipere communionem laicam debere.

Digitized by Google

communion: but if he was detected by another, then he should do five years' penance; and after that, only be received to lay-communion at the last." And, in another canon, they decree,[i] "That if either bishop, presbyter, or deacon, was found guilty of fornication, committed after his ordination, such an one, for the scandal and heinousness of his crime, should not be admitted to communion, no, not at his last hour." There are a great many other canons in this Council, which deny communion to the very last, to all such criminals in general, as are there specified in them: and though the clergy be not particularly named, yet, doubtless, they were included in the number, when such crimes as lapsing into idolatry are ordered to be punished with perpetual excommunication, without readmission at their last hour.[k] For we cannot suppose these canons were more favourable to the clergy than to others, since we have found this Council inflicting the same penalty upon them upon other occasions.

## SECT. VIII. — *The Council of Rome, under Felix III.* (*an.* 487).

I will conclude these collections with the testimony of a Roman council, held under Felix III. (an. 487). Here the case of several bishops, presbyters, and deacons, came to be considered, who had submitted themselves to be rebaptized by the Arians, in Africa, during the time of the Vandalic persecution: and the determination that was made upon it, was this;[l] that for so doing "they should be subjected to a perpetual penance all their lives, and not be allowed to be present, either at the prayers of the faithful, or the prayers

[i] Conc. Illiber. c. xviii. (Labbé, vol. i. p. 973.) Episcopi, presbyteri, et diacones, si in ministerio positi, detecti fuerint, quod sint mœchati, placuit, et propter scandalum, et propter profanum [nefandum] crimen, nec in fine eos communionem accipere debere.

[k] Ibid. c. ii. (p. 969.) Flamines, qui post fidem lavacri et regenerationis sacrificaverunt . . . placuit eos nec in fine accipere communionem. See c. i. iii. &c.

[l] Conc. Rom. III. sub Felice II. al. III. c. ii. (Labbé, vol. iv. p. 1076, C.) Usque ad exitus sui diem, in pœnitentia (si resipiscunt) jacere conveniet; nec orationi non modo fidelium, sed ne catechumenorum omnimodis interesse, quibus communio laica tantum in morte reddenda est.

Digitized by Google

of the catechumens, but only be restored to lay-communion at the hour of death."

Now, then, if such bishops, presbyters, and deacons, were denied the communion of laymen, and only allowed it at the point of death, and sometimes not that neither; it is plain, they could not be true authorized priests, because they were sunk one degree below laymen in the Church: unless any one will say, that a man may be an authorized priest of the Church, who is not so much as an authorized layman of it. Yet the Church never made any order for rebaptizing such as were baptized by these men, but received them as she did others, only by imposition of hands and confirmation. Which is a certain argument to prove, that she did not repeat the baptism of laymen, since she received not only the baptism of those whom she herself made laymen, but of those also whom she thrust one degree below laymen, by subjecting them to excommunications and anathemas, and denying them the benefit and privilege of lay-communion in the Church.

---

## CHAPTER VI.

THE OBJECTION TAKEN FROM THE NOTION OF AN INDELIBLE CHARACTER IMPRINTED IN THE ORDINATION OF A PRIEST EXAMINED, AND SHEWED TO BE OF NO FORCE AGAINST THE FORMER ALLEGATIONS. WITH AN ACCOUNT OF THE FIRST ORIGINAL AND MEANING OF THAT TERM IN THE WRITINGS OF THE CHURCH.

### SECT. I. — *What meant by an 'Indelible Character' imprinted in Baptism.*

THERE is but one objection against all that has been said in the foregoing discourse, which has occasionally been answered already: but because, to some, it seems to carry more weight than it really does, because of the ambiguity of the terms, I will here give it a distinct consideration. The objection is this; that there is an 'indelible character' imprinted on a man when he is ordained a priest, which no

Digitized by Google

heresy, or schism, or degradation, or excommunication, can obliterate: therefore, though they may suspend him from the exercise, yet they cannot take away from him the power and authority, of the priesthood. The antecedent of this argument is, in some measure, true, if rightly explained and understood: but the inference, or consequence, drawn from it, is altogether false: and, unless it be false, the Catholic Church has been always under a great mistake, to pretend to take away the power and authority of priests from them. Nay, the power of God and Christ himself could not do it, if this notion holds true; for the Church always pretended to act by the authority of God and Christ, that is, by the power of the keys committed to her, in taking away the ministerial authority from such priests as deserved her censures. So that if the Church could not do it, God and Christ could not do it; or else the Church was to blame, to assume a power which did not belong to her. But the truth of the matter is, that the 'indelible character' of a priest's ordination implied no such thing in the opinion of the ancients, as this objection supposes. For they never imagined, that a priest, by virtue of any such character, could preserve his ministerial authority, in spite of all the censures of the Church inflicted on him; that he was a priest when they made and called him no priest, and reduced him to the order and quality of a layman; that he was a priest when they excommunicated and anathematized him, and cast him, not only out of clerical communion, but all church-communion, and sometimes would not allow him so much as the communion of a layman, at the point of death. There must be a strange virtue, an 'indelible character,' indeed, if it could preserve sacerdotal authority in a priest, after so many attempts of the Church to deprive him of it. It is therefore worth inquiring, Whether there be not some mistake in this matter? and, Whether the wrong notion some have entertained of the nature of an 'indelible character' do not lead them into errors about it? Now, the best way to come by the true notion and import of this term, is to examine, first, what it was taken to signify in baptism. For an 'indelible character' was always supposed to be imprinted as much in baptism as in ordination; though I do

Digitized by Google

not remember that any ancient council expressly used that term about either, but only said something that may be reckoned equivalent to it; and that is this, as it relates to baptism;—that a man who is once truly baptized, can never do any thing that will so far erase or cancel his baptism, as that he shall need, upon any occasion, to be rebaptized with a second baptism. Thus far the ancients believed an indelible character in baptism. Though a man turn his back on Christianity, and totally apostatize and fall away from the profession of it; though he turn heretic or schismatic; though he excommunicate himself, or be excommunicated by the Church; though he embrace Paganism, or Judaism, or any other opposite religion; though he curse and blaspheme Christ in a synagogue or in a temple, as many of the old apostates did; though he become a Julian, or an Ecebolius, and "trample under foot the Son of God, and count the blood of the covenant an unholy thing, and do despite to the Spirit of grace;"—yet, after all, if this man turn again to Christianity, he was not to be received by a second baptism: his repentance and the Church's absolution was sufficient, in that case, to reinstate him in his ancient profession, and he was not to be rebaptized to be made again a Christian. The Church had but one baptism for the remission of sins; and the virtue of that was so far indelible, that it would always qualify the man that had received it, to be admitted to communion again after the greatest apostasy, only by a true repentance and reconciliatory imposition of hands, without rebaptizing. This was what the ancients understood by what we now call the indelible character of baptism. But they were far from thinking that a man, who was such an apostate, had any right or authority, whilst he was an apostate, to challenge any of the common privileges of a Christian: they did not think, whilst he was a Pagan or a Jew, that he was properly a member of the Christian Church still, because of his baptism; or that he had any right to be called Christian, or to be admitted to the prayers of the Church, and much less to the communion with other faithful laymen: and yet, after all, there was so much of a Christian in him, by virtue of his



Digitized by Google

baptism, that he needed not to be baptized again as a mere Jew or Pagan. His baptism was such as nothing could obliterate; it would remain with him when he was an apostate, and either go to hell with him to his condemnation, or bring him back to heaven and the Church by the way of repentance, not rebaptization. Now, if any one should ask, Whether such an apostate, while he continued an apostate, was a Christian; the answer must be in the negative, or, at least, with the qualification of a common school-distinction of *simpliciter et secundum quid*. For, simply and absolutely speaking, it would be incongruous and against propriety of speech to call an apostate, Jew, or heathen, or Turk, a Christian: for words and names, when they have no limitation to any more particular meaning, are to be taken, *in sensu famosiori*, 'according to the common sense,' in which they are usually understood. Now, by a Christian, properly speaking, we usually mean a man in perfect and full communion with the Christian Church. Therefore an apostate from Christianity is never absolutely and simply called a Christian, but an apostate, whether it be Jew, or Pagan, or Mahometan, or under any other denomination. But yet there is something of a Christian in this apostate, that is, his baptism; in respect of which he is not so perfectly a no-Christian, as one that never was baptized: and if in this respect only, in such a qualified sense, any one will give him the title of an apostate Christian, which is, as the Schools speak, only a Christian *secundum quid*, in respect of the baptism which he once received in the Christian Church, and which will for ever continue with him; I cannot think it worth while to contend about words or names, when men are otherwise agreed about the import and signification of them. Let him be a Christian in this sense; yet he has no right or authority, till he repents and is reconciled, to join in communion with true Christian laymen, notwithstanding the indelible character of his baptism. And they who would fain make something more of this character, understand not what it means, or what has been the true discipline of the Christian Church in reference to the reiteration of baptism.

Digitized by Google

SECT. II. — *That the 'Indelible Character' of Ordination is of the same Nature.*

Having seen the whole mystery that is contained under this hard word, 'indelible character,' in baptism; let us now examine, Whether it be not much after the same manner in the 'indelible character' of ordination. A priest, when he is ordained, receives such a consecration to a ministerial office by imposition of hands, as needs not upon any occasion to be a second time repeated, to establish him in the execution of such an office. There is the 'indelible character' of it, the very same as in baptism: a man needs no more to be reordained, than to be rebaptized. But what, if a priest should turn idolater or apostate, and offer sacrifice at the heathen altars, instead of the altar of God? Would he preserve the authority of a true Christian priest, or the name and office of a priest, whilst he was actually engaged in such diabolical prevarication? Would the virtue of 'indelible character' have been thought to extend so far as this, by the ancient councils of the Church? They who say so, and would persuade the world to believe so, must first reconcile contradictions, and shew how a man can have the authority of a priest, when his own apostasy, and God and the Church, by their censures, have taken his authority from him. Let them produce as good proofs for that, from ancient councils, as I have produced to the contrary; and then, perhaps, the notion of an 'indelible character' may seem to have more weight in it than I have represented. But, till that be done, I believe the world will hardly be persuaded, that an apostate priest retains the right and authority of a true Christian priest, any more than an apostate layman retains the right and authority of a true Christian layman. A priest, indeed, may be admitted, if the Church thinks fit, to clerical communion again, without a new ordination, as a layman may be admitted to lay-communion without a new baptism: but that is all that an 'indelible character' can signify in either. It does not give authority to an apostate priest, to act as a priest of God, whilst he continues an apostate, and is deprived, by God and the Church, of all authority of the priest-

Digitized by Google

hood. If the Church, in some great exigency, receives such an one to his office again, which she never did but upon some very extraordinary occasion, in that case there was no need of a new ordination, but only to relax her censures, and give him that authority again, which his crimes and her censures had taken from him. And this was parallel to the case of baptism: there was no need to baptize a man a second time, in order to admit an apostate to the communion of laymen: in like manner, there was no need to ordain a man a second time, in order to admit him to clerical communion. The way of admission was the same in both; it was done by repentance and absolution, without rebaptizing the one, or reordaining the other. So that the notion of an 'indelible character' could signify no more in the one case, than it did in the other. Therefore, as an apostate layman had not the right and authority of a lay-Christian, whilst he continued an impenitent apostate, notwithstanding any force of the 'indelible character' of his baptism; but might be admitted to the privilege of lay-communion again without rebaptizing, when the Church thought fit to loose him from his bonds, and reconcile him by the power of the keys committed to her:—so, in like manner, an apostate priest had not the right and authority of a Christian priest, whilst he continued an apostate, notwithstanding any force of the indelible character of his ordination; but only was in a capacity to officiate again without reordaining, if the Church should find it necessary to employ such an one again, by restoring him to the authority which, by her censures, she had taken from him. And, unless this be allowed, we make plain nonsense of all the ancient councils, and charge them moreover with tyranny and usurpation, in pretending God's authority to take away the name, and office, and authority, of the priesthood from delinquent clerks, when no such power or authority was committed to them. And there is an end, too, of all the discipline of the Church, as to what concerns the censure of her delinquent clergy: she may curb and correct her laity, and deprive them of all right and title to the communion of Christian laymen; but all her censures are but a *brutum fulmen* against the clergy. For, if after she has

Digitized by Google

degraded a priest, and said, he neither is, nor shall be, a priest; shall neither have the name, nor office, nor dignity, nor the authority, of a priest, but only act and communicate as a private layman; if, after she has also excommunicated a contumacious priest, and by casting him out of the Church reduced him to a state one degree below a layman;—notwithstanding all this, that priest can pretend, that by virtue of his 'indelible character,' he is as true an authorized priest, after all the thunderings of the Church against him, as he was before;—what then becomes of all the power and discipline of the Church, and all her authority to censure and silence offending and apostate priests? A censure, it seems, may affect the conscience of a priest, but not his authority: that will remain entire to him by virtue of his 'indelible character,' let the Church use what authority she will to deprive or degrade him. I wish the defenders of this unlimited power would not undermine the authority of the Church, whilst they are so seemingly zealous to defend the authority of the priesthood. I desire them to read over all the canons of the ancient councils, as I have done upon this occasion, and then see whether they can find any one single canon, that places any such virtue in an 'indelible character' as is here pretended.

### SECT. III.—*The Name of 'Indelible Character' not to be found in any Ancient Council.*

Indeed the name of 'indelible character' never so much as occurs once expressly in any act or canon of an ancient council. And they who have been most inquisitive after its synodical establishment, are at a loss to find it any where else but in the Council of Florence or the Council of Trent: which is an argument that the ancient councils knew nothing of it. But if they did not own the name, they might, however, own the thing in other terms. Yes, in a qualified sense, as I have explained it. They owned, that a man who was once truly baptized, whether in the Church or out of the Church, whether by a true authorized Catholic priest, or by a heretical apostate, could never want a second baptism to reconcile him to the Church after any transgression.

Digitized by Google

And they likewise owned, that a man, who was once truly ordained a priest, could never want a second ordination to qualify him to officiate as a minister in the Church, if the Church thought fit to receive him into office again, and give him her authority and commission to act, after any great apostasy or censure. But they never said, that when they had bound an apostate under all the bonds of anathema and excommunication, and divested him of all clerical power and authority, that still he had the authority of a priest, when they had taken it from him. Such a notion of 'indelible character,' I will venture to affirm, is not to be met with in any ancient council.

### SECT. IV.— *In what Sense St. Austin owns and allows it in Heretical Priests.*

The Fathers, indeed, very often call baptism by the name of σφραγὶς and σημεῖον, which we may translate indifferently 'a seal,' or 'a sign,' or 'a mark,' or 'a character.' And in St. Austin, the term, *character Dominicus*, and *character regius*, 'the Lord's character,' and 'the royal character,' is frequently used when he speaks of baptism. But, then, by this they mean baptism itself only, and not any distinct character or quality, or spiritual sign upon the soul, and that distinct from sanctifying grace too, as the modern schoolmen love to word it: for it was only another name for baptism, which was the mark or character by which complete Christians, who devoted themselves to Christ, were distinguished from Jews and Pagans, who had no such character upon them. And, therefore, so far as baptism was indelible, so far this character was indelible, but no further. St. Austin used the same term about ordination, and he makes the indelibility, both of baptism and ordination, as I conceive, to consist in this,—that a man, once truly baptized or ordained, though he turn apostate, never needs a second baptism or a second ordination. "It is manifest," says he,[a] "that baptism remains inseparably in the baptized

[a] Aug. de. Bapt. lib. v. c. xv. (Bened. 1700, vol. ix. p. 102, A.) In baptizato baptisma inseparabiliter permanere manifestum est; quia in quodlibet profundum malorum et in quamlibet horribilem voraginem peccatorum irruat baptizatus, usque.

Digitized by Google

person; because whatever depth of iniquity, whatever horrible gulf of sin, he falls into, though it be into the ruin of apostasy, he never wants baptism; and, therefore, whenever he returns by repentance, his baptism is not repeated, because he is judged not to want it." This he often repeats in his books against the Donatists;[b] and observes further,[c] "That Cyprian himself, and all that followed him, were of the same opinion:" which appears from several of Cyprian's Epistles,[d] and the Council of Carthage held under him: for though they rebaptized such as were baptized by heretics and schismatics, yet they never rebaptized any that had been baptized in the Church, though they lapsed, or apostatized,

ad apostaticam ruinam, non caret baptismo: et ideo per pœnitentiam redeunti non redditur, quia eo non potuisse carere judicatur.

[b] Aug. de Bapt. lib. i. c. i. (Bened. 1700, vol. ix. p. 53, B. 4.) Nullus illorum negat habere baptismum etiam apostatas, quibus utique redeuntibus et per pœnitentiam conversis, dum non redditur, amitti non potuisse judicatur.—Ibid. lib. vi. c. xv. (edit. cit.) Hic admonemur iterum quærere, cur dixerit, 'exceptis his sane, qui in ecclesia Catholica fuerint ante baptizati?' An quia non amiserant quod intus acceperant? &c.—Id. cont. Petil. lib. ii. c. vii. (p. 149.) Qui baptizati apostatant, et per pœnitentiam redeunt, non eis redditur baptismus, quem si amitterent, redderetur.—Cap. xlvii. (edit. cit.) Apostatæ si redeant, non quasi eum (baptismum) amiserint, baptizantur, sed quod in se permanenti injuriam fecerint, humiliantur. (Vol. ix. p. 171, E. 12.)

[c] Ibid. de Bapt. lib. iii. c. xi. (Bened. 1700, vol. ix. p. 76, C. 14.) Hoc enim ipse etiam Cyprianus cum ceteris statuit, ut si ab hæresibus redirent ad ecclesiam, quicunque fuerant in ea baptizati, non jam per baptismum, sed per pœnitentiam reciperentur: unde constat eos non posse amittere recedentes, quod non recipiunt remeantes.

[d] Cyprian. Epist. lxxi. ad Quint. (Oxon. 1682, p. 194.) Quod nos quoque hodie observamus, ut quos constet hic baptizatos esse, et a nobis ad hæreticos transisse, si postmodum, peccato suo cognito et errore digesto, ad veritatem et matricem redeant, satis sit in pœnitentiam manum imponere.—Id. Epist. lxxiv. ad Pompeium, p. 216. Observatur a nobis et tenetur, explorata et perspecta veritate, ut omnes qui ex quacumque hæresi ad ecclesiam convertuntur, ecclesiæ unico legitimo baptismo baptizentur, exceptis his qui baptizati in ecclesia prius fuerant, et sic ad hæreticos transierant: hos enim oportet, quum redeunt, acta pœnitentia, per manus impositionem solam recipi.——Conc. Carth. apud Cyprian. n. viii. (p. 232.) Censeo, omnes hæreticos et schismaticos, qui ad Catholicam ecclesiam voluerint venire, non ante ingredi, nisi exorcizati et baptizati prius fuerint: exceptis his sane, qui in ecclesia Catholica fuerint ante baptizati. Et n. xxii. Censeo flebiles et tabidos hæreticos baptizandos esse, quum ad ecclesiam venire cœperint: . . . absque his, qui de ecclesia fideles supplantati, ad hæresis tenebras transierunt: sed eos per manus impositionem restituendos.

Digitized by Google

or fell from the Church, into any heresy or schism; because they supposed, with St. Austin, that no crime could so far obliterate or extinguish baptism, as to make an apostate need a second baptism. And as an apostate layman could not need a second baptism to make him a complete lay-Christian, but only repentance and absolution, to reinstate him in full communion with the Church; so an apostate clergyman, though he was reduced to lay-communion, or fallen below it, could not need a new ordination, but only the Church's commission and authority to release him of his bonds, and invest him with clerical power again; which she did by absolution, or the power of the keys, and not a new ordination. Thus far, therefore, St. Austin,[e] and all the ancients, allow both baptism and ordination to be given inseparably to those to whom they are given: they are indelible so far as that neither of them need to be repeated upon apostates: but that apostates, whilst they remain apostates, are still true authorized priests, is a doctrine not to be met with in any ancient council of the Church, nor private writer.

### SECT. V.— *What the Papists mean by their 'Indelible Character.'*

But it may be said that modern writers take 'indelible character' in another sense, and extend it so far as to preserve the authority of a priest in him, even after the Church has degraded or excommunicated him by her lawful censures. But who are these modern writers? Either those of the Popish or Protestant communion. For the Popish writers, I own, they make quite another thing of the 'indelible character,' from what the ancients did, though they can scarce tell an intelligent reader what they mean by it: Some call it a spiritual relation, others a spiritual quality imprinted on the soul, as an effect of baptism, distinct both from the external sacrament, and the internal sanctifying

[e] Aug. cont. Parmen. lib. ii. c. xiii. See cited above, Part. i. chap. i. sect. xvi. note (c), p. 47.

Digitized by Google

grace of it: which is a sort of abstruse language the ancients were not acquainted with. But whatever the nature of it be, they are thus far agreed with the ancients, that the indelibility of it consists in this, that a baptism, once truly given, needs not upon any occasion to be repeated. As to the character of a priest given him in his ordination, they seem still to recede further from the doctrine of the ancients. For it does not suffice them to say, it is such an 'indelible character' as may qualify a degraded priest to officiate again without a new ordination, if the Church think fit to recall him to his station; but they will have it to be a perpetual spiritual power or authority impressed upon the soul of a priest, which no removal from his office can take from him: for so Bellarmin,[f] the great oracle of the Romish Church, in express terms, delivers it as the Catholic opinion. Which is as contrary to the common sentiments of the ancient Church, as the doctrine of the Council of Trent is contrary to the doctrine and discipline of the first six general councils, which take away all power and authority from degraded clerks, till the Church thinks fit to restore them to their authority again, by a relaxation of her censures. There is a plain opposition and contrariety in the style and language of the ancient Church to this modern new doctrine. "We deprive a wicked priest of the power and authority of his priesthood," say the ancient councils. "No," says Bellarmin, "that ye cannot do; ye may remove him from his office, but ye cannot take away his spiritual power: that remains imprinted on his soul by an indelible character." "We make him no priest," say the ancient councils: "We leave him not so much as the name of a priest; we reduce him from the order of priests to the order of laymen." "Hold there," says Bellarmin, "none but modern heretics do this; it is not in the power of the Church to make a man, who is one day a priest, the next day become a layman." Is not this to make heretics of all the ancient

[f] Bellarm. de Sacram. Ordinis, lib. i. c. x. tom. ii. p. 970. Convenit inter Catholicos duplicem esse effectum hujus sacramenti, primo potestatem spiritualem perpetuam, in cujus signum imprimitur character, &c.

Digitized by Google

Church, and to talk in a style that they were utter strangers to? Unless any one will soften Bellarmin's words and say, he means no more by his perpetual spiritual power and character of a priest, than that the Church may recall him to his office again, if she pleases, without giving him a new ordination.

### SECT. VI. — *How far an 'Indelible Character' is allowed by Protestant Writers.*

But, in the gross sense of the words, it is not more contrary to the doctrine and practice of the ancient Church, than it is to the general stream and current of Protestant writers. Bellarmin himself owns this: for he says,[g] "All the heretics of these times" (by whom he means all the Protestants, from the days of Wickliffe to his own time) "deny this character" (as he describes it). "For they will have the ecclesiastical ministry to be only a simple office, which may be given and taken away again; so that a man may be to-morrow a layman, who to-day is a minister and a pastor." This was then the general sense of the Protestants about this new Roman character, if Bellarmin does not misrepresent them. And that he did not much wrong them, appears from the opposition which they presently made to the Council of Trent, as soon as she framed her canon about this 'indelible character,' with an anathema, as if it had been the greatest point of faith, against those that did not believe it. Calvin wrote his Antidote, and Kemnitius [Chemnitz] his Examen of the Council of Trent, and they both reject and refute it as a modern fiction. Calvin says,[h] "It was a fable first invented in the schools of the ignorant monks, and that the ancients were altogether strangers to it: and that it had more of the nature of a magical enchantment, than of the

[g] Bellarm. de Sacram. Ordinis, lib. i. c. x. tom. ii. p. 970. Hæretici hujus temporis characterem præcipue negant. Volunt enim ministerium ecclesiasticum esse simplex officium quod possit dari et auferri; proinde cras fieri laicos, qui sunt hodie ministri et pastores.

[h] Calvin. Antidot. Conc. Trid. Sess. vii. c. ix. Quod de 'charactere indelebili' fabulantur, ex eadem prodiit officina: nam veteribus hoc totum ignotum fuit, et magis consentaneum est incantationibus magicis, quam sanæ evangelii doctrinæ. Eadem ergo facilitate repudiabitur, qua excogitatum fuit.

Digitized by Google

sound doctrine of the Gospel in it. And, therefore, it might be rejected with the same facility that it was invented." Chamier confirms his notion of the novelty of it at large, not only from the Fathers, but from the schoolmen themselves,[i] from Durand, and Scotus, and Gabriel Biel, and De Rubione, and Cajetan, who all confess, that there are no footsteps of it to be found, either in Scripture or antiquity; but that it is wholly owing to the authority of the Church, and that not very ancient neither. For it is observable, that Peter Lombard knew nothing of it: he never mentions any other character but *the character* of Christ in baptism,[k] by which he means only the external form of baptizing, "In the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost:" which form, or character, is owned to be ancient enough, but is far from being that internal quality, which is pretended to be imprinted on the soul. He that would see more of the Protestant allegations and oppositions against this novelty, may consult Kem-

[i] Chamier. Panstrat. tom. iv. de Sacramentis, lib. ii. c. xii. n. iv. Accusat Calvinus hoc quidquid est commenti, tanquam incognitum Scripturæ: sed et recens. In quo venit merito vapulanda Cotoni impudentia, qui hoc ipso eum loco dixit fateri antiquitati fuisse cognita. Sed habuit Calvinus conscios ex ipsis scholasticis. Durandus enim sic diserte, 'Omnes moderni,' inquit, 'profitentur, imprimi characterem in aliquibus sacramentis: et nos loquentes ut plures, dicamus cum eis characterem non nihil esse.' Cajetanus etiam, 'Sacramenta imprimere characterem ex sacra Scriptura non habetur: sed ex ecclesiæ auctoritate et non multum antiqua;' sed et Scotus teste Soto, 'tenuissimam opinionem ostendit se habere de charactere. Contendit enim probare, hujuscemodi adsertionem neque ex sacris litteris, neque ex sanctorum Patrum testimoniis colligi posse, neque vero per rationem naturalem. Et subjungit, quod quum neque Magister Sententiarum, neque Gratianus de Consecratione distinctione quarta, ubi sententias Patrum de Baptismo computavit, de charactere mentionem fecerit, indicium est, non esse effectum ita multum necessarium. Nihilominus propter solam ecclesiæ auctoritatem totam non existimat ipsum negare.' Gabriel, 'Conclusio prima: characterem esse ponendum eo modo, quo definitus est, nec ratio necessaria demonstrat, nec evidens auctoritas probat.' Immo De Rubione, 'Conclusio prima est, quod non oportet ponere characterem modo prædicto summum inprimis alienum suscipienti aliquid per sacramentum.' Paullo post, 'Tertia conclusio est, quod character ponitur in esse de facto ab ecclesia. Hæc conclusio est vulgata, licet non videatur multum certa: quum nec ad hoc esse expressa determinatio ecclesiæ videatur.'

[k] Lombard. lib. iv. idstinct. vi. p. 303. Ex his aperte colligitur, quod qui etiam ab hæreticis baptizati sunt, servato charactere Christi, rebaptizandi non sunt.

Digitized by Google

nitius [Chemnitz],[l] and Rivet,[m] and Vorstius,[n] and Gerhard,[o] and Alting,[p] and Perkins, and Amesius [Ames],[q] and such others as have written particular dissertations against it. I shall only trouble the reader with one of them, the famous Turretin, who was a man of great judgment and learning, in this last age. His account of the matter, as it is summed up by his contractor Riissenius, is this,[r] "That the three sacraments, of baptism, confirmation, and orders, according to the Popish doctrine, imprint a spiritual and indelible character in the soul; which is given as the reason why they cannot be reiterated or repeated. But we reject this device as a fiction, and we say, The faithful, indeed, have a double seal or character; the one internal, which is the obsignation of the Holy Spirit, whereby they are sealed to the day of redemption; the other external, which is baptism, by which we are distinguished from Turks, Jews, and other infidels; but beside these we acknowledge no other character." Nothing now, I think, can be plainer than this, that the 'indelible character,' so much contended for by the Romanists, is a mere fiction, and contrary both to the sense of the Protestants, and the doctrine of the Primitive Church; which both allow an indelible character, as that signifies the outward form of baptism, or form of ordination, that needs

[l] Chemnit. Exam. Conc. Trid. part. ii. ad. c. ix. Sess. vii. (pp. 45–47, edit. Francof. 1706, 8vo.)

[m] Rivet. Cathol. Orthodox. tract. iii. quæst. vi. (tom. iii. opp. Roterod. 1660, pp. 308, 309.)

[n] Vorst. Anti-Bellarm. p. 361.

[o] Gerhard. Loci Commun. tom. iv. de Sacramentis, n. xcv. p. 184.

[p] Alting. Theol. Elenctica, loc. xiv. pp. 594–597.

[q] Perkins. Demonstratio Problematis, p. 130, (pp. 278–280, Hanov. 1604, 8vo.) —— Ames. Bellarmin. Enervat. tom. iii. c. v. p. 47.

[r] Riissen. Comp. Theologiæ Turretin. loc. xvii. p. 242. Pontificii docent characterem esse signum spirituale, et indelebile, impressum sive in animæ substantia, sive in ejus potentiis, vi et efficacia trium sacramentorum, baptismi, confirmationis, et ordinis: et hanc volunt esse causam, propter quam hæc tria sacramenta non sunt iteranda, quod nempe imprimant characterem indelebilem. . . . Nos tale commentum rejicimus, et dicimus, Fideles duplex habere sigillum, internum unum, nimirum Spiritum Sanctum, quo obsignantur in diem redemtionis (Ephes. iv. 29); alterum externum, nimirum baptismum, quo distinguimur a Turcis, Judæis, et aliis infidelibus; sed nullum alium characterem agnoscimus.

Digitized by Google

not be repeated; but utterly deny any other character imprinting a spiritual power on the soul of a priest, whereby he is authorized to perform sacerdotal offices perpetually, notwithstanding any deposition or excommunication. The Protestants are so far from allowing this, that some of them think an ordination may, without sacrilege, be repeated; so Calvin, Chemnitz, Alting, Balduin. And it is observable, that, at Geneva, they repeat the ceremony of ordination upon the removal of a minister from one church to another: as I have had occasion to shew formerly in a discourse of another nature.[s] And they who do not think this either necessary or convenient, or that even an apostate or heretical priest should be restored to his office by a new ordination, do not yet maintain that a man is an authorized priest, after he is totally degraded from his office by the authority of the Church: but that the Church has power to take away all sacerdotal authority from such a delinquent priest, if she sees it necessary, and reduce him to the state of a layman; and that this was actually the discipline and practice of the Primitive Church in many cases; as I have represented it, I hope, to the satisfaction of all ingenuous readers, and the conviction of some of my erring brethren, who perhaps would more edify the Church, if they would bear a part with me in carefully studying and explaining the ancient discipline of the Church, instead of entangling themselves and others with the perplexed and intricate, and sometimes dangerous, notions of the schoolmen. Chamier, I am sure, makes no scruple to affirm, that, by the discipline of the ancient Church, a criminal priest might be degraded from his order, and be made a layman. For explaining the ancient notion of reducing clerks to lay-communion, which Bellarmin and some others ignorantly understood of communion only in one kind, according to the modern phrase, he says,[t] "It was so denominated neither from the place,

[s] See French Church's Apology for the Church of England, in the conclusion.

[t] Chamier. Panstrat. tom. iv. de Eucharist. lib. ix. c. iii. n. xxxvii. p. 487. Disce appellatam fuisse laicam, non a loco, non ab speciebus, non a tempore, sed

Digitized by Google

nor from the species, nor from the time, but from the person that received it, because he that before was a clerk and in the nomenclature of clerks, was now a layman and in the order of laymen." Upon the whole matter, then, we now see clearly, that according to the ancient Church, and in the opinion of Protestants, a criminal clerk might be degraded from his order, and be made a layman, notwithstanding the Popish pretence of an indelible character imprinting a spiritual power on his soul; which the ancient Church knew nothing of, and the Protestant schools reject and refute as a novel invention. The consequence of all which is, that a clerk, so degraded, is no longer an authorized priest, or public minister, of the Catholic Church, but a private man in the order of laymen: and all heretics and schismatics, that are formally degraded by the Church, are in this predicament, that is, in the order and quality of laymen; only with this difference, that if the Church, in any great exigency, thought fit to recall them to their former station, she did not think it necessary to give them a new ordination; but only a new commission or authority, which they wanted before. And yet she never rebaptized such as were in due form baptized by these men, in their unauthorized state. From whence it plainly follows, that she received the baptism of unauthorized laymen, because she received the baptism of those whom she herself made laymen, by taking all clerical authority from them. Which was the thing I designed to shew. And how solidly and fairly, without any artifice or sophistry, but the plain dint of historical truth, I have proved this beyond exception, I now leave to the judgment of every impartial reader; only repeating the argument once more in form for memory's sake.

The baptism of deposed heretics, and schismatics, and degraded clerks, and excommunicated clerks, is the baptism of unauthorized persons, either made laymen, or set one degree below laymen, according to the general sense of the Catholic Church.

a persona: nimirum, quod qui ante fuerat clericus, sive in clericorum nomenclatura, nunc sit laicus, et in laicorum ordine.

Digitized by Google

But the baptism of such deposed heretics, and schismatics, and degraded clerks, and excommunicated clerks, if ministered in due form, was always received by the Catholic Church without rebaptizing.

Therefore the baptism of unauthorized persons, laymen, or one degree below laymen, if ministered in due form, was always received by the Catholic Church without rebaptizing.

The first proposition in this argument has been fully made out in this discourse; and the second proposition, in the former part of this history, even to the satisfaction and content of the adversaries themselves, who have nothing to object against it. And if both the premises stand good, it will be impossible to shake the conclusion.

SECT. VII.— *What Submission is due to the Judgment of the Catholic Church, in such Points of Discipline as Rebaptizing and Reordaining.*

All I shall add further in this chapter, is only a seasonable and useful reflection on what has hitherto been said, in relation to the opinion and judgment of the Catholic Church, upon this subject, viz. that a great deference is due to her wisdom and authority in all such controverted points of discipline, as those of rebaptization and reordination of heretics, and schismatics, and other unauthorized laymen; both because they are matters of discipline, and because they seem not to be so fully and expressly determined in Scripture. The Council of Nice ordered the Meletians to be reordained, but the Novatians and Donatists were received without it: and yet the ordinations of the Meletians were as good as the Donatists, and something more canonical than the Novatians: but it became every private man to comply with these different determinations, and not break or disturb the peace and communion of the Church upon either account, but to submit to her authority and wisdom in both, as presuming she had good reasons and authority, in both cases, to order matters as she judged most conducing to the common interest of the public. So if she had determined, that all persons baptized by heretics, or schismatics, or other unauthorized laymen, should have been rebaptized, I think every

Digitized by Google

wise and good man ought to have complied with this rule of discipline, rather than break communion upon it: but since she has at all times determined the contrary, I judge it no small crime, at this time of day, for any private man to oppose his own sentiments to the common sense and practice of the universal Church, which can have no other effect but to raise a flame, and disturb her peace, and fill men's heads with endless scruples about their baptism. If it were not for the apprehension of such mischiefs, I would never have given myself the trouble to have made such a laborious search into the ancient discipline and practice of the Church upon this head: and I think it now high time to put an end to such a dispute, after all things have been so fully discussed and set in so fair a light, that have any relation to it. And, therefore, I intend to take my leave of this subject, if the adverse party will suffer me to go on quietly with a more necessary work, in which I have already made some progress, and I hope not without general benefit and satisfaction to the Church, as soon as I have resolved a few difficulties, concerning the ordinations, baptisms, and communion, of heretics, which may perhaps fall in the way of an intelligent reader.

---

## CHAPTER VII.

### A RESOLUTION OF SOME DIFFICULTIES CONCERNING THE COMMUNION OF HERETICS, AND THEIR BAPTISMS AND ORDINATIONS.

#### SECT. I. — *Whether it be lawful to hold Communion with Heretical Priests before they be degraded?*

THE first difficulty may arise concerning holding communion with heretical priests. For if, according to the doctrine of the ancients, they be not true authorized priests, but only laymen, or a degree below laymen; then it seems unlawful to hold communion with them in any ministerial acts whatsoever. And yet in two cases there seems almost a

Digitized by Google

necessity to do it. 1. When they are not yet fully discovered or censured by the Church. 2. When a whole Church is turned heretical, and there are no other but such priests to holds communion with. The first of these cases has no great difficulty in it: for the ancients allow, that till heretics be fully manifested, convicted, and censured by the Church, men may innocently communicate with them. The case often happens to be, as it was in the strugglings of the Arian heresy; heretics pretend to be Catholics, and shelter themselves under Catholic terms, and profess their faith in the same creeds and form of words as Catholics do, at the same time that they put an equivocal and heretical sense upon them. This was the subtle artifice of the politic Arians, called Eusebians, from their ringleader Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, all the time of Constantine, and of some of them in the time of Constantius. They durst not oppose the Council of Nice formally and directly, and therefore they used her creed, and spake and taught as other Catholics did, in the form of sound words, and contented themselves to put their own private heretical sense upon them. Nay, many of them, when they had got the word 'consubstantial' thrown out of the creed in the time of Constantius, under pretence of peace, durst not yet, in plain terms, propose the Arian blasphemies to the people, but spake in Scripture terms, and words seemingly expressing the Catholic faith, which the people understood only in the true, genuine, Catholic sense, whilst they had their own fallacious and insidious meaning to put upon them. Now, though these men were heretics before God, yet they were not so in the eye of the people, who honestly took them to mean as they spake, without any fraudulent sense or equivocation. And so long the people were thought excusable in holding communion with them, because they did not communicate with them in their errors, but intentionally only in the Catholic faith. But when the heretics were once plainly detected and convicted, then it was no longer lawful for the people to join with them, but to fly from them as wolves in sheep's clothing, and avoid them as ministers of Antichrist, and angels of Satan, who, by a diabolical subtlety and malice, only



Digitized by Google

transformed themselves into angels of light. This is the resolution which St. Hilary gives of this difficulty, with a particular respect to the case of Auxentius, the Arian bishop of Milan, and Ursatius, and Valens, who pretended to speak orthodoxly, and professed their faith in such terms, as seemed to carry in them nothing but the ancient Catholic doctrine; but they had an insidious meaning, which the innocent people could not always discover:[a] "They ascribed to Christ," says Hilary, "the name of God, because this was also given to men. They confessed him to be truly the Son of God, but only as every one else is made truly the son of God, by the sacrament of baptism. They allowed him to be before time and ages, because this may be said of angels and the devil. So in reality they ascribed nothing more to Christ the Lord, than what was proper to men or angels. His peculiar property they denied; that he was Christ the true God, that is, of the same divinity with the Father. But all this impiety was for a long time coloured over, and carried on by fraud and artifice. And so it happened that the people of Christ were not mortally hurt under the priests of Antichrist, whilst they thought their faith and meaning had been agreeable to their words. They heard Christ called God, and they supposed him to be truly so. They heard him called the Son of God, and they thought the verity of a son was implied in the nativity of God. They heard him said to be before all time, and they thought that being before all time was the same thing as being eternal. So the people's ears were much more pious than the hearts of the

[a] Hilar. cont. Auxentium, p. 102, (Venet. 1750, vol. ii. p. 468, A. 9.) Tribuunt Christo Dei nomen; quia hoc et hominibus sic tributum: fatentur vere Dei Filium; quia, sacramento baptismi, vere Dei filius unusquisque perficitur: ante tempora et sæcula confitentur; quod de angelis atque et diabolo est non negandum. Ita Domino Christo sola illa tribuuntur, quæ sunt angelorum propria, vel nostra. Ceterum, quod Deo Christo legitimum et verum est, Christus Deus verus, id est, eadem esse Filii, quæ Patris, divinitas denegatur. Et hujus quidem usque adhuc impietatis occasio [per fraudem] fraude perficitur, ut jam sub Antichristi sacerdotibus Christi populus non occidat, dum hoc putant illi fidei esse, quod vocis est. Audiunt Deum Christum, putant esse quod dicitur. Audiunt Filium Dei; putant in Dei nativitate inesse Dei [filii] veritatem. Audiunt ante tempora; putant id ipsum ante tempora esse, quod semper est. Sanctiores aures plebis, quam corda sunt sacerdotum.

Digitized by Google

priests." Thus far, therefore, they communicated with the heretics, supposing them to be orthodox and sincere, according to their outward expressions. But when once it was made appear to them that they were heretics indeed, then Hilary tells them,[b] "They ought no longer to communicate with them as ministers of Christ, but to avoid them as antichrists, as angels of Satan, as enemies of Christ, as devils, though by the emperor's favour they were in possession of the churches. They should not be so much in love with walls and buildings, as to think the true Church of God was confined to them, and for their sakes have peace with the Arians. For Antichrist himself was to sit within the walls of the Church. So that mountains, and woods, and lakes, and prisons where the prophets of God were cast, were safer places than the buildings of the Church in such a condition. Therefore depart," says he, "from Auxentius, that angel of Satan, that enemy of Christ, that wicked destroyer, that denier of the faith, which he made profession of before the emperor, in such a manner as to deceive him; and so deceived him, as to blaspheme Christ. Let him gather as many synods as he pleases against me; let him proscribe me as a heretic by public titles, as he has often done already; let him stir up the anger of great men as much as he will against me: yet he shall never be any better, in my opinion, than a devil, because he is an Arian. Nor will I ever desire to be at peace with any but those, who, according to the rule of the Nicene fathers, anathematize the Arians, and preach Christ to be the true God." By this one instance, to

[b] Hilar. cont. Auxentium, (Venet. 1749–50, vol. ii. p. 470, at bottom.) Unum moneo, cavete Antichristum: male enim vos parietum amor cepit, male ecclesiam Dei in tectis ædificiisque veneramini, male sub his pacis nomen ingeritis. Anne ambiguum est, in his Antichristum esse sessurum? Montes mihi, silvæ, et lacus, carceres, et voragines, sunt tutiores: in his enim prophetæ, aut manentes, aut demersi, Dei spiritu prophetabant. Absistite itaque ab Auxentio, Satanæ angelo, hoste Christi, vastatore perdito, fidei negatore: quam sic est regi professus, ut falleret; sic fefellit, ut blasphemaret. Congreget nunc ille quas volet in me synodos, et hæreticum me, ut sæpe jam fecit, publico titulo proscribat, et quantam volet iram in me potentium moliatur: mihi certe ille numquam aliud quam diabolus erit, quia Arianus est: neque pax aliquorum umquam optabitur, nisi eorum, qui secundum patrum nostrorum apud Nicæam tractatum, anathematizatis Arianis, Christum Deum verum prædicabunt.

Digitized by Google

which I could add many more, it is easy to judge how far it was deemed innocent to hold communion with undetected heretics, and where the bounds of that communion end, viz. when heretics openly declare themselves, and are convicted of their errors against the Catholic faith, then they were no longer to be communicated with as priests of God, but to be avoided as the priests of Antichrist, as angels of Satan, as destroyers of the faith, with whom no peace could safely be maintained, though they were in possession of the churches.

### SECT. II. — *Whether it be lawful to communicate with Heretics, when a whole Church is heretical?*

But what if the whole Church should turn heretics, would it be lawful in that case to communicate with them? I answer, if by the whole Church be understood the whole Catholic Church, the supposition is not to be allowed: for the whole Catholic Church never was totally involved in any damnable heresy. In the greatest prevalency of the Arian faction, the whole Church was far from being overspread with that error, as a learned person[c] has undeniably demonstrated against those that suppose it. And it is but a vulgar error to say, that the Council of Ariminum was a council of Arian bishops, or that the whole world upon that turned Arian. For though St. Jerome's testimony be commonly alleged for that, yet I have had occasion heretofore[d] to shew the contrary from St. Jerome himself, who vin-

[c] Bull. Defens. Fid. Nicæn. in Epilogo, (p. 513, edit. Amstelod. 1688, 4to.) (Oxford, 1827, vol. v. p. 804.) Atqui, inquies, si tam prorsus heterodoxa fuit Arii opinio, qui potuit brevi tempore, postquam exorta fuit, in tantum prævalere, ut totus pene orbis Christianus fieret Arianus, quemadmodum conquestus est Hieronymus? Respondeo, si Arianum fieri sit genuina Arii dogmata amplecti, verum non esse (quod pace Hieronymi dictum sit) maximam Christianorum partem factam unquam fuisse Arianam. Constantii quidem temporibus et aliquanto post quamplurimi, præsertim in Oriente, Arianos amplexi sunt; ipsum vero Arianismum paucissimi, ad cæteros comparati. Quippe homines falsissimi, nisi ubi idoneos invenerint auditores, impia dogmata celarunt, fidemque suam fere professi sunt verbis, quæ antiquam et Catholicam sententiam præ se ferrent; indeque factum fuit, ut pro Catholicis pene ubique haberentur, atque agniti essent, etiam ab iis qui alioqui germana ipsorum placita ex animo detestati sunt. &c.

[d] Origin. Eccles. book vi. chap. iii. sect. x. vol. ii. p. 163.

Digitized by Google

dicates the bishops of Ariminum, as Catholic bishops, but only insidiously imposed upon by Ursatius and Valens (the same that St. Hilary complains of), who pretended to be true Catholics, and offered a Catholic creed to the Council, which they subscribed in a Catholic sense, though the subtle Arians put their own fraudulent and equivocal sense upon it. Which as soon as the Catholic bishops understood, they declared their abhorrence of the fraud, and utterly detested their communion. Which is a more pregnant evidence still, that the face of the whole Catholic Church was never totally overspread with Arianism. Nor can it be shewed, that in the darkest times of Popery, the whole Catholic Church was sunk into the dregs of Popish errors: for, to say nothing of the Eastern Churches, which never came under the Romish yoke and tyranny, I have made it appear, in the first part of this Scholastical History, that there were sufficient numbers among the Albigenses, which never subscribed or fell in with the Romish idolatry and corruptions. And I do not find any of my opposers inclined to call this in question. So that the supposition of the whole Catholic Church having, at any time, fallen into damnable heresy, is a supposition in fact without any foundation. But if by the whole Church be meant only the aggregate body of some particular Church, as that of Rome, then there is no absurdity in supposing, that such a whole Church may fall into damnable heresy. And if the question then be, Whether it was lawful to join in communion with such a heretical Church; it will easily be resolved by the foresaid answer of St. Hilary: if men are not well apprised of any heresies maintained in such a Church, so far her communion may be innocent to them, as the communion of those Arian bishops was to the Catholics that Hilary mentions: but if they are known heresies, the communion of heretical priests is to be avoided, and Catholic communion to be preserved with the rest of the Church in a spiritual union with them, when a man has no opportunity corporally to join with them. But if men, through invincible ignorance, join in a heretical communion, which they, through want of judgment, suppose still to be orthodox and innocent,—as perhaps it was the case of many

Digitized by Google

in the dark times of Popery, and may be so still in many countries, where nothing but Popery is professed,—what allowances God will make for such honest ignorance, is best known to himself, and it belongs not to us positively to determine. The Church always made a distinction betwixt heresiarchs and their followers; between the guides and the people; and between such as were born and bred in the Church, and afterwards apostatized into heresy, and those that received their errors from the tradition and seduction of their parents. Insomuch that St. Austin goes so far in his great charity as to say,[e] "That they who defend a false and perverse opinion, without any pertinacious animosity,—especially if by any audacious presumption of their own they did not first invent it, but received it from the seduction of their erring parents, and are careful in their inquiries after truth, being ready to embrace it when they find it,—such men are not to be reckoned among heretics." He means, I suppose, they have not the formality of heresy in them—pride and obstinacy—as commonly the first seducers have; and therefore they may, perhaps, find favour with God, who knows the sincerity of their hearts; and we may judge charitably of them, at the same time that we do not think it lawful to join in communion with them.

## SECT. III.—*Whether, in any Case, it be lawful to desire the Baptism of Heretics?*

The next difficulty may arise concerning the desiring of baptism from the hands of a heretical priest, where a Catholic cannot be found to do it. Shall a man, in that case, rather die without baptism, than receive it from the hands of such a priest? The question has no difficulty at all in ordinary cases: for the ancient rule was very plain, that where a Catholic priest might be had, no man might

[e] Aug. Epist. clxii. ad Episc. Donat. p. 277, (Bened. 1700, vol. ix. p. 67.) Qui sententiam suam, quamvis falsam atque perversam, nulla pertinaci animositate defendunt, et præsertim quam non audacia præsumtionis suæ pepererunt, sed a seductis atque in errorem lapsis parentibus acceperunt, quærunt autem cauta sollicitudine veritatem, corrigi parati, quum invenerint; nequaquam sunt inter hæreticos deputandi.

Digitized by Google

have recourse to a known heretic under pain of excommunication.[f] If it be said, that Constantine was baptized by Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, who was an Arian; I answer, that Eusebius professed himself a Catholic all the time that Constantine lived; and he durst do no otherwise, for fear of banishment. So that Constantine did not desire baptism of him but only upon presumption of his being a Catholic; and if Eusebius prevaricated, and was a secret heretic, that was nothing to Constantine, who judged him to be a Catholic, and, in the simplicity of his soul, desired baptism of him as a Catholic, and not as an Arian. For otherwise it is not to be imagined, that a person so zealous against Arianism as Constantine, would ever have submitted to have been baptized by an Arian, so much against the rule of the Church, in an ordinary case, when many other Catholic bishops might as easily have been procured to do it. But the difficulty of the question is in cases of extremity, when a man is born or lives in a country where there are none but heretics, and must either die without baptism, or receive it from them: What is to be done in such an exigency? St. Austin resolves this case plainly, without any hesitation,[g] "That if a man is compelled by extreme necessity, where he cannot have a Catholic to give him baptism,

[f] Conc. Ilerd. c. xii. (Labbé, vol. v. p. 1613.) Catholicus qui filios suos in hæresi baptizandos obtulerit, oblatio illius in ecclesia nullatenus recipiatur. —— Hieron. cont. Lucifer. c. v. Sciens ab hæreticis baptizatus, erroris veniam non meretur. (Vallars. vol. ii. p. 184, A. 9.)

[g] Aug. de Bapt. lib. i. c. ii. (Bened. 1700, vol. ix. p. 54, B. 11.) Si quem forte coëgerit extrema necessitas, ubi Catholicum per quem accipiat, non invenerit, et in animo pace Catholica custodita, per aliquem extra unitatem Catholicam positum acceperit, quod erat in ipsa Catholica unitate accepturus, si statim etiam de hac vita emigraverit, non eum nisi Catholicum deputamus. Si autem fuerit a corporali morte liberatus, quum se Catholicæ congregationi etiam corporali præsentia reddiderit, unde numquam corde discesserat, non solum non improbamus quod fecit, sed etiam securissime verissimeque laudamus: quia præsentem Deum credidit cordi suo, ubi unitatem servabat; et sine sancti baptismi sacramento, quod ubicumque invenit, non hominum, sed Dei esse cognovit, noluit ex hac vita migrare. Si quis autem, quum possit in ipsa Catholica accipere, per aliquam mentis perversitatem eligit in schismate baptizari; etiamsi post ea venire ad Catholicam cogitat, quia certus est ibi prodesse sacramentum, quod alibi accipi quidem potest, prodesse autem non potest; procul dubio perversus et iniquus est, et tanto perniciosius quam scientius.

Digitized by Google

to take it at the hands of one who is not in Catholic unity; in that case he should be reckoned as a Catholic, though he died immediately, because he was in heart and mind a Catholic, and would have been baptized in Catholic unity, if there had been any opportunity to have done it. If such an one lives, and corporally joins himself to the Catholic congregation, from whence in heart he never departed, we not only not disallow what he has done, but securely and truly commend him for it: because he believed God to be present in his heart, where he preserved unity, and would not depart out of this life without the sacrament of baptism, which he knows to be God's, and not men's, wheresoever he finds it. But if any one, when he might receive it in the Catholic Church, by some perverseness of mind, chooses rather to be baptized in schism, though he afterward design to return to the Church, because he is certain the sacrament will profit him in the Church, but not elsewhere, though he may receive it elsewhere;—this is a perverse and wicked man, and so much the more perniciously so, by how much the more knowing he is." St. Austin gives the same resolution, in case a man receives baptism from a schismatic in extreme necessity at the point of death:[h] "This baptism is advantageous to him, because he receives it with a heart and mind never separated from the Catholic unity of the Church: whether he lives or dies, he is spiritually in the Church, and therefore his baptism is of advantage to him." So that cases of necessity make many things innocent and allowable, which in ordinary cases are strictly prohibited by the laws of God and man. The resolution of this case may, perhaps, be of some use to all such who are baptized in coun-

[h] Aug. de Bapt. lib. vi. c. v. (p. 110.) Potest salubriter accipere a separato, si ipse non separatus accipiat: sicut plerisque accidit, ut Catholico animo et corde ab unitate pacis non alienato, aliqua necessitate mortis urgentis in aliquem hæreticum irruerent, et ab eo Christi baptismum sine illius perversitate perciperent, et sive defuncti, sive liberati, nequaquam apud eos remanerent, ad quos numquam corde transierant.—Ibid. lib. vii. c. lii. Illi ab eis utiliter accipiunt, qui non ipsis corde et moribus, sed sanctæ domui copulantur. Qui autem separatiores, non magis in domo quam ex domo sunt, neque omnino utiliter habent, neque ab eis utiliter accipitur, nisi forte accipiendi necessitas urgeat, et accipientis animus ab unitatis vinculo non recedat. (Vol. ix. p. 136, B. 6.)

Digitized by Google

tries where the Church is overrun with heresy or schism; and to those who are baptized in infancy, by the force of their parents carrying them to heretics or schismatics for baptism, when they might have had it in the Church: though the parents cannot plead necessity in that case, yet the children, perhaps, may be allowed to do it; and the Church may accept their plea, when they detest their parents' iniquity, and return unfeignedly to the unity of the Catholic Church.

SECT. IV.—*Whether the Ordinations of Heretics and Schismatics may be accepted by the Church without Reordaining?*

The last and greatest difficulties seem to be about the ordinations of heretics and schismatics, and such degraded bishops as are divested of their authority to ordain. For if they are not true authorized ministers in that state, but, at the best, only in lay-communion; as they have no authority to baptize, so neither can they have any just authority, in such a state, to ordain. But, then, the question is, What if they do ordain in such a state? Of what force are their ordinations? How did the Church receive pretended clerks so ordained? Did she wholly disannul their ordinations, and give them a new ordination; or only supply what was deficient in them, by adding her own authority and confirmation? To this I answer, The Church used her liberty in this matter to receive or reject such ordinations, as she thought expedient, and judged most necessary, in the present exigency of affairs. She received the ordinations of the Novatians and the Donatists without reordaining, at the same time that she rejected the ordinations of the Meletians, and would admit none of their clergy to officiate in the Church without a new ordination. And yet Meletius, the father of the Meletians, was once a regular archbishop in the Church, if that had been sufficient to have given a perpetual authority to his ordinations: but Novatian, the father of the Novatians, and Majorinus, the first founder of the Donatists, were never truly ordained bishops in the Church, and, consequently, never had true and lawful

Digitized by Google

authority to ordain others. There must, therefore, needs be some other reason why the Church was more favourable, in the case of the Novatians and Donatists, than she was in that of the Meletians: for it could not be because the ordinations of the Novatians and Donatists were originally more authentic than the other; since it appears, from the observation I have made upon the history of both, that they were rather less authentic, as descending from those who were never ordained themselves true bishops in the Church. But the truth of the matter seems to be this: the Church never esteemed any of these three sects to be lawful ministers, either bishops, priests, or deacons, but only in the condition of laymen, according to the rules and discipline of the Church then prevailing: but because they retained the outward form of ordination, as they did the outward form of baptism, though they had no authority to give the one more than the other, the Church used her liberty, either to reject the ordinations wholly, or to confirm them by her own authority, as she judged expedient for the reclaiming those sects, or promoting her own welfare and peace, as the exigency of the case required. Therefore she rejected the ordinations of the Meletians, and would admit none of them to officiate in the Church, till they had received a new ordination; because the Meletians had joined interest with the Arians, and deserved a more severe censure. And they were but an upstart sect, not inveterately rooted, nor far spread, and, therefore, might more easily be obliged to submit to the Church's discipline. But the Novatians and Donatists never sided with the Arians, but generally joined with the Church in opposing them; and therefore the Church was a little more inclined to shew favour to them. Besides they were become firm and inveterate sects, which had spread themselves in many parts of the world, and gained great strength: so that there was little hopes of reducing them by strictness and exactness of discipline: therefore the Church, in this exigency, to regain them more universally, thought it more conducing to the public interest of religion to abate something of the rigour of her own discipline upon this occasion, which otherwise

Digitized by Google

would not have been allowed but only for the sake of peace. For, in strictness of discipline, no one ordained or baptized by heretics was ever to be admitted to clerical dignity in the Church, either by virtue of his former ordination, or by a new one: but, for prudential reasons, the Church sometimes dispensed with these rules, and admitted some by a new ordination and some without it, but both the one and the other by a new commission and authority which they had not, nor could have in heresy or schism: for out of the Church there was no just authority either to baptize or to ordain, as has been abundantly proved before; but the authentic performance of these things belonged only to the ministers of the Church. If it be asked, How the Church could admit such to officiate without a new ordination? I answer, Upon the same ground that she admitted them without a new baptism: for the outward form of ordination had been given them before, though by persons who had no authority to give it: and, though no just authority could be conveyed by such unauthorized ordainers, yet the Church did not think fit, in such exigencies, always to repeat the outward form of ordination, but only supplied what was deficient in it, by her own just authority and commission granted to them; which was thought sufficient to complete an unauthorized and incomplete ordination, as the unction of chrism or imposition of hands in confirmation was thought sufficient to complete an unauthorized and incomplete baptism.—But why, then, did not the Church observe this method in receiving all heretics to clerical dignity, without a new ordination? Why did she not admit the Meletians and others without reordaining, as well as the Novatians and Donatists? I answer, Because this was matter of prudence and discretion; and the Church used her authority and just liberty, in dispensing her commission to others out of the Church, in such a manner, as she in wisdom judged most convenient for the reduction of heretics, and preservation of her own peace; which are the great ends to be aimed at in all parts of ecclesiastical discipline: and it is but fair to let the Church judge for herself, what is fittest to be done in all such cases. And if

Digitized by Google

men would consent, in modesty, to be guided by this rule, we shall need dispute no longer about rebaptizing those who are baptized by unauthorized baptism, whether administered by heretics or other laymen; since this has been so fully determined by the universal consent and practice of the Catholic Church, in her first six general Councils, and all others that have said any thing upon the subject, except those of the Cyprianic age, which are no balance against the counterpoise judgment of the Church in all ages.

Digitized by Google

AN

# APPENDIX,

CONTAINING

SOME REMARKS ON THE AUTHOR OF "THE SECOND PART OF LAY-BAPTISM INVALID."

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

AN

# APPENDIX,

*&c. &c.*

---

## CHAPTER I.

A SHORT WAY TO END THE CONTROVERSY WITH THIS AUTHOR ABOUT UNAUTHORIZED BAPTISM, BY SHEWING HIS GREAT IGNORANCE OF THE ANCIENT DISCIPLINE OF THE CHURCH WHILST HE SUPPOSES THE ANCIENT HERETICS TO BE TRUE AUTHORIZED PRIESTS IN ACTUAL COMMISSION, WHEN THE CHURCH HAD REDUCED THEM TO THE STATE OF LAYMEN.

When I had finished the foregoing Discourse, there came to my hands an anonymous treatise, called, "The Second Part of Lay-Baptism Invalid;" wherein the author pretends to shew, that the ancient Catholic Church never had any ecclesiastical law, tradition, or custom, for the validity of baptisms performed by persons who never were commissioned by bishops to baptize; all proved from Mr. Bingham's Scholastical History of Lay-Baptism, and from other evidences not produced by that historian. I must no longer call this author by the name of Mr. Lawrence, for he is very angry at my incivility, as he pleases to term it, for doing so before; when yet I thought no harm in doing that which his greatest friends do every day, and speak of him in all public places of concourse, with a design to honour him under that appellation and distinction. But the gentleman is out of humour with me upon other reasons; and therefore takes any occasion to express his anger and resentments

Digitized by Google

against me, for being really so uncivil as to pretend to understand ecclesiastical history, and the discipline of the Church, better than himself, and for being a little too free in correcting his mistakes, and exposing the dangerous consequences and absurdities of some of his opinions. But however it be, I will neither trouble myself nor the reader any further about his name, but stick to the merits of his cause, and shew him that he has made a gross mistake about the sense and practice of the ancient Catholic Church, after all his pretences to Councils and Fathers, and the general assistance of all his friends, as when he said, "a major proposition was a minor or an assumption;" and, therefore, if he will be but as ingenuous in retracting one plain error as another, our controversy will be at an end, and he will trouble the world no more with such tedious accounts of ancient history, to so little purpose. I will not say of him, as he says of his learned adversaries in his preface (page 2), "That if they make false arguments to defend error, he shall not esteem such their methods to be only mistakes, but something worse, considering the greatness of their knowledge:" I have more charity for him than this comes to, though he has so little for others; and believe, that when he turned a minor proposition into a major, and thereby made Lucifer a witness to an assertion which he never dreamed of, that it was only an undesigned mistake. But yet there are two things which I cannot but a little wonder at: 1. That so learned and acute a man as Dr. Hicks should carefully read over his papers, and never observe such a heap of blunders, till an adversary came more kindly to discover them. And, 2. That this gentleman should be so severe and uncharitable in his censures of other men's intentions, who needs so much candour and charity to put a favourable construction upon his own. For any man's knowledge is great enough to transcribe the words of an English writer; and if he transcribes them wrong, in favour of his own opinion, would not an untoward critic, of an ill-disposed temper, be apt to suspect the worst, and uncharitably construe it to be something more than a mistake, when outwardly it bears such a face of an ill design

Digitized by Google

to impose upon his readers? Now, if this gentleman would not be pleased to have base suggestions insinuated against himself, he ought to have so much candour and charity as not causelessly to insinuate the like against others, and represent them as abettors of heretics, and schismatics, and of those who would dissolve and take away the necessity of the Christian priesthood, and of Christ's authority here on earth, and of all revealed religion too: which are his kind suggestions in the end of his preface (page 21), concerning the principles of those, who only labour to defend the principles and practices of the Catholic Church against his own heterodoxies and novelties in opinion. Some of those learned men he thus characterizes, have been as zealous opposers of heretics and schismatics, and written as learnedly and judiciously in defence of the Christian priesthood, and Christ's authority on earth, and revealed religion, as either he or any of his assistants can pretend to do. But something, true or false, was to be insinuated against their integrity, to frighten young students in divinity from reading and considering their works; as if he and his friends were the only men that could teach them sound divinity, after one thousand seven hundred years' experience. And yet I will give the world a plain demonstration, that he has said much more for the honour and encouragement of heretics and schismatics, and more dishonourable things against the true power of the Christian priesthood, and the authority of the Church, which he pretends to be defending, than any of those that have appeared in defence of the Church's power and authority against him.

To come close to the point, the thing I mean is this: this author asserts, over and over again, both in his preface and his book, that, according to the discipline of the ancient Church, heretics and schismatics, even when they were cut off and cast out of the Church, were still allowed to be true authorized and commissioned priests, invested with full power, authority, and right to baptize; and that upon this principle only, the Church allowed of the validity of their baptism, because they were then priests in commission, and not in the state of laymen.



Digitized by Google

Now, I affirm and maintain, on the contrary, that both these assertions are as false, as for a man to say that black is white, or that a major proposition is a minor. And if this author will please to peruse the foregoing discourse with any tolerable ingenuity and candour, he will receive abundant satisfaction as to both the particulars I maintain against him. The questions are matters of fact, upon which the whole controversy turns and depends: viz. Whether heretics and schismatics, under the censures of the Church, were reputed to be actually priests in commission, with full power, authority, and right to baptize; or were not rather deprived of their commission and authority, and reduced back again to the state of laymen? And then, Upon what foot the Church received the baptisms of such men? For that she received them upon some foot or other, in fact, there is no dispute: but the question is, Whether she received them as the baptisms of true authorized priests, not deprived of their commission; or as the baptisms of usurping priests, deprived of their commission, and reduced to the state of laymen? The determining these questions of fact aright will determine the whole dispute I have with this author concerning the sense and practice of the ancient Church. For if heretical priests have no better title to the true authority of the Christian priesthood than laymen; if they lose the commission which they once had, by the censures of the Church, and are reduced to the state of laymen; then, I hope this author, or any one, will own that the Church, in receiving the baptisms administered by such persons in such a state, received the baptisms of those whom she esteemed not true authorized priests, or priests in actual commission, but only laymen. To quibble now about their once having received a commission, which other laymen never had, will here be to no purpose: for if they may forfeit and lose their commission, then it is the same thing whether they had or had not a commission; since their acts, after they have forfeited their commission, and are legally deprived of it, are as much unauthorized and uncommissioned, as those who never had any commission at all, that is, the merest laymen.

Digitized by Google

Now, then, this is the thing which I will fairly try with this author and all his learned assistants, to put a short end to this whole debate, Whether heretical and schismatical priests, whom the ancient Church formerly censured and degraded, were, during that censure and state of degradation, reputed to have the authority of true priests of God, and remain undeprived of their commission, notwithstanding the Church's censure? This author affirms it; I absolutely deny it, and will prove my position to him universally, and in such a manner as he shall not be able to contradict it.

For, first of all, he owns and confesses, without scruple (page 53), that all the Cyprianists were entirely of this opinion, that heretics and schismatics were but as laymen; that they had no power, authority, or right to baptize. Thus far we are exactly agreed. The proofs he has alleged out of Cyprian, are full and convincing enough, and almost the very same that I have produced in the foregoing discourse. So that we can never dispute further about the opinion of the Cyprianic Churches as to this particular, Whether heretics and schismatics, after they are formally censured, be commissioned priests, or only uncommissioned laymen? When the Church, by her lawful power, withdraws their commission, then they are no longer authorized priests, but only in the state and condition of laymen, because the Church has withdrawn her authority and commission from them.

But, then, this author pretends, that the other Churches in the Cyprianic age were of a different opinion, and had a different discipline; and that the Catholic Church also, in after-ages, had other sentiments of heretical and schismatical priests, and esteemed them to be actually true authorized and commissioned priests, even when they were under their errors and the Church's censures. Now, these are our author's grand mistakes, which all the learning and assistance of his party will never clear him of; and I require him either to make good his assertions, which I am confident he never can do; or else confess his errors, and put an end to this whole debate, so far as concerns the history of the Church; and then he may dispute, for me, with whom he

Digitized by Google

pleases. I do not charge him, as he does his learned adversaries, with any wicked designed mistakes, but reckon he was led into them by the information and authority of others, who themselves seem not to have duly considered the exact discipline of the ancient Catholic Church. For I have made it appear as plain in the foregoing discourse, as the nature of any subject is capable of, as plain as that a major proposition is not a minor, that all the Churches in the world, in Cyprian's time, were of Cyprian's opinion as to this particular, that heretical and schismatical priests were not truly and properly priests (however they might equivocally bear the name) whilst they were formally under the Church's censure; but were only treated in the quality and condition of laymen, or less than laymen, if they were excommunicated and cast out of the Church. And I have made it further appear, that the Catholic Church, in after-ages, never departed from this opinion; if we may judge of her sense by the decrees of general or particular Councils, and the declarations of private Fathers, all concurring in the same opinion. I have shewed Dr. Brett, and this author with him, that Cornelius, bishop of Rome, writing to Cyprian, declares it to be the sense,—the unanimous, uncontested sense of all the bishops in the world, that criminal bishops, such as idolaters and heretics, once formally declared and censured, were no longer to be reputed priests, but laymen. And if the Catholic Church agreed with them in after-ages, here is as full consent as can be required in any case against these gentlemen's assertions. I will repeat nothing that I have said before, but only add the ample testimony of St. Ambrose, who, in his Books of Repentance, against the Novatians, plainly speaks the sense of the whole Church upon this matter of sacerdotal authority and power; denying the Novatians and all other heretics to have any right or authority to perform any sacerdotal acts, such as binding and losing, or retaining and forgiving sins.[a] "For this

[a] Ambros. de Pœnitent. lib. i. c. ii. Jus enim hoc solis permissum sacerdotibus est. Recte igitur hoc ecclesia vindicat, quæ veros sacerdotes habet: hæresis vindicare non potest, quæ sacerdotes Dei non habet. Non vindicando autem ipsa de se pronuntiat, quod cum sacerdotes non habeat, jus sibi vindicare non debeat sacerdotale. (Paris. 1836, vol. iv. p. 89.)

Digitized by Google

power," says he, "is permitted to the priests alone. Therefore, the Church rightly claims it, because she has true priests: but heresy cannot claim it, because it has no priests of God. And whilst heresy cannot claim it, it pronounces sentence against itself, that while it has no priests, it cannot lay claim to sacerdotal power." Can any words be plainer than these to prove that heretics are no true priests, or priests of God? Or, that there are no true priests but only in the Church, however the Novatians or other heretics might pretend to that name? Could any one more fully or emphatically express himself against the Novatian heretics, if he had a mind to say they were no priests, because they were heretics, and consequently could lay claim to no part of the sacerdotal authority and power? I shall despair of understanding any man, if this be not the plain sense of St. Ambrose.

Now, then, I would ask our author, How came it to pass, that the baptisms given by these Novatians, who are thus positively declared to be no priests, nor to have any sacerdotal authority or power, came afterward to be received both by the great Council of Nice, and the whole Catholic Church after it, as valid, so far as not to need the outward form to be repeated by rebaptization? It could not be because they were priests: for they were no priests, nor invested with any sacerdotal authority as priests of God, as St. Ambrose peremptorily determines. If, therefore, their baptism was received as valid, it is plain, it must be upon some other reason than their having sacerdotal authority, for they had none; and that shews also, that the authority of the administrator is not so absolutely essential to the outward form of baptism, as our author makes it, in the opinion of the ancient Church; since they received the baptisms of those whom they reckoned to be no priests, nor invested with any sacerdotal powers, as is evident in this case to a demonstration.

Our author must now have recourse to his usual evasion, by which he can answer a book in two words, and say, that St. Ambrose here speaks only his own private sense of the Novatians and other heretics, and not the public sense of

Digitized by Google

the Church. But I have already precluded him from this little subterfuge, by shewing at large, that this was not the private sense of St. Ambrose, but the voice of the whole Church; the sense of the Cyprianists, which he himself owns, and the sense of Cornelius and all the bishops of the world in the time of Cyprian, who had no dispute with Cyprian upon this point; the sense of the Ante-Nicene and the Post-Nicene Fathers together; the sense of the six general councils, and all the provincial councils that have said any thing against heretics: they all agree with St. Ambrose in this, that heretics are no true priests or priests of God, nor invested with any sacerdotal right, authority, or power: but that if they had originally any commission given them by the Church, investing them with sacerdotal authority, they lose that authority, when the Church withdraws her commission by her censures. And then it is all one whether they ever had sacerdotal authority or not: it is certain they had none by the discipline of the ancient Church, when once she had recalled her commission, and taken their authority from them; which she thought she had power and authority to do: and then in that case heretics had no more sacerdotal authority than the merest unauthorized layman. All this I have made as plain to our author, as that a major proposition is not a minor; and, therefore, I hope he will be as ingenuous as he was before, and own himself to have made an undesigned slip, in representing the discipline of the ancient Church quite otherwise than it appears to be, and what a man must shut his eyes upon, and wink hard, not to be convinced of.

I would not have our author now quibble with me again about those who never received any sacerdotal commission from bishops, and say the case of the ancient heretics and these men is not parallel. For if men lose the commission they once had, they have no more authority by virtue of that commission, than they who never had any commission at all, and therefore, in this respect, their case is parallel; the one has no more sacerdotal authority than the other: the only difference is, that the one never had a commission or authority; the other once had it, but afterward forfeited and

Digitized by Google

lost it; and then they were in the same condition with those that never had it; they were equally no priests, equally destitute of sacerdotal power. This our author owns to have been the sense of the Cyprianists; and I have shewed him, what he did not apprehend before, that it was also the general sense of the whole Catholic Church in all ages.

Besides, I have observed and proved, in the second chapter of the foregoing discourse, that the Novatian heretics, of whom we are now discoursing, never had any real and true episcopal ordination among them. Their first founder, Novatian, was only a nominal and false bishop, a no-bishop, by all the rules and discipline of the Catholic Church; whereby his pretended ordination was disannulled from its first original: whence he himself, being no bishop, could give no episcopal or sacerdotal authority to others, against the rules of the Catholic Church.

This I have there proved from very plain evidences; to which I shall only add now the testimony of Pacianus, bishop of Barcelona, who wrote against the Novatians (an. 370) several epistles, wherein he maintains,[b] "That Novatian was never truly ordained a bishop, but was only a nominal bishop, a false bishop, a no-bishop, because he had no proper ordainers, no lawful consecration; his consecration was against all ordinary rules; he was not ordained by the bishops of the province, but by the letters and instigation of some pretended confessors; and that, when the see was full, and another bishop legally ordained before him." So Novatian had only the name and title of a false bishop, not the right and power of a new one. He also asserts,[c] that the Novatians had no true priests among them, rightly consecrated. Therefore, though they might give pretended

[b] Pacian. Epist. ii. ad Sempronian. Bibl. Patr. tom. iii. p. 56. Cognosco Novatianum sine consecratione legitima episcopum factum, ideoque nec factum. — Epist. iii. p. 59. Novatianus tuus, ne falso quidem adhuc episcopatu sacerdos, &c. —Id. p. 60. Ille ex auctoritate epistolarum, sedente jam Romæ episcopo, adversum fas sacerdotii singularis, alterius episcopi sibi nomen assumit. — Epist. ii. p. 55. Quem, consecrante nullo, linteata sedes accepit. — Epist. iii. p. 57. He denies that he was 'Jure ordinario consecratus ab episcopis,' &c.

[c] Ibid. Epist. iii. p. 58. Vestræ plebi unde Spiritum, quam non consignat unctus sacerdos?

Digitized by Google

ordinations, and call themselves bishops, presbyters, and deacons, yet they were but nominally so, being destitute of that original power in their first founder, which he ought to have had, to have handed down a succession of priests among them. For aught, then, that appears to the contrary, these Novatians were in the same condition with those who never received any true sacerdotal commission at all, and therefore must be ranked in the same class with uncommissioned laymen. All the difference is, they pretended to a formal ordination, and a Divine commission, and the authority of priests, which mere laymen do not use to do in the Church. But the Church made no account of these pretences, but treated them as laymen in a double respect, both because they first wanted a true ordination and commission originally; and, secondly, because, though they had once a true commission and authority, yet they had forfeited their title to all sacerdotal authority and power, by becoming heretics, and falling under the Church's censure.

I know, indeed, this author pretends (page 198) that the Council of Nice acknowledged the Novatians "to be true priests and not laymen, persons destitute of commission; but still bishops, priests, and deacons, with an indeleted, unrepealed commission to baptize:" and says (page 202), "that they and other heretics and schismatics had the Church's lawful authority and commission to baptize." Which would be very strange, indeed, that the Church should first by her discipline vacate the commission of heretics, and take away their authority from them; and say particularly of the Novatians, that they were no true priests of God, nor had sacerdotal authority, nor yet any true ordination or commission from the beginning; and yet, after all, say likewise, as this author represents it, that these very heretics were still true bishops, priests, and deacons, with the Church's lawful authority and unrepealed commission to baptize, and consequently perform all other spiritual offices of the ministerial function. This would be monstrous, indeed, that the Church should so contradict herself upon the very same article of discipline in relation to the very

Digitized by Google

same persons. But the truth of the matter is, our author understood not the Church's discipline in this point, and therefore he makes a woful misrepresentation of it. The Council of Nice, nor any other council, ever allowed the Novatians to be true bishops, presbyters, or deacons, during their heresy or schism; but looked upon them as false priests, destitute of sacerdotal power, and the Church's lawful authority and commission to baptize: but if they were willing to return to the unity of the Church, then they might enjoy those honourable stations by the Church's authority and commission, which they had only in pretence, without any legal authority or commission, laid claim to before. This was not to say, that heretics and schismatics were true priests of God, invested with the Church's authority and commission, whilst they remained in heresy or schism, degraded and divested of all sacerdotal authority by the Church's censures: for this were a manifest contradiction in itself, and utterly inconsistent with the proceedings and discipline of all the ancient councils. But the meaning is, that they who before were only nominal priests, should now, by the Church's favour, have the authority of real priests, and act by her commission in the same station that they had usurped before, in contradiction to all the laws and rules of the Catholic Church, which with one voice declare heretics and schismatics to be no true priests of God, whilst they continue in that state, whatever this author pretends to the contrary.

We need not now dispute what names they were to be called by, whether priests or laymen. If they had lost the Church's commission and authority, they were as much unqualified, for that time, as to any acts, intents, or purposes of the sacerdotal power, as the merest layman, who never had any authority or commission from the Church. Our author owns it was so by the discipline of the Cyprianic Churches; and I have proved that it was so by the discipline of all Churches. And, till our author disproves this, the charge will lie upon him, that he has grossly mistaken and misrepresented the practice and discipline of the ancient Church, by putting the authority and com-

Digitized by Google

mission of true priests of God into the hands of heretics and schismatics, which the ancient councils unanimously agree to take from them.

I may now appeal to his own conscience and the world, to decide, which of us looks most like an abettor of heretics and schismatics, or pleads most for the power of the Church and the authority of the priesthood; he who, against the sense of all the ancient Church, puts the power of the priesthood, and the commission and authority of the Church, into the hands of heretics and schismatics, and makes them true priests of God; or I, who, in compliance with the rules and discipline of the ancient Church, shew how all these things may be denied them, and all these powers and privileges taken from them. His assertions tend to the detriment and dishonour of the Church's power, and the debasement of her authority, by saying, and that against truth and fact too, that all the ancient Churches, except the Cyprianic, allowed heretics and schismatics to be true priests of God, to be true bishops, priests, and deacons, even whilst they were declared heretics, and under the Church's censures. Which is such a reproach to the ancient discipline, and such a stretch upon the truth of ancient history, that one would think a man had never looked into a volume of the ancient councils, that could be guilty of so grand a mistake, and make such a dishonourable and partial representation of the Church's discipline, when there is scarce a council in all the tomes, but what might have taught him otherwise. Therefore, as well for the honour of the ancient Church, as to shew this gentleman and his friends their error, I have shewed at large, from incontestable evidences, from the history of general and provincial councils, authorities that cannot be turned off by the little artifice of saying, they are only private authors that speak their own private sense, that the ancient discipline was not so favourable to the priesthood of heretics as this author supposes. And now let the world judge, who has said most for the honour of sacerdotal powers, or who is the greatest favourer of heretical pretensions.

But this author and Dr. Brett were both of them very

Digitized by Google

sensible, that unless heretics were allowed to have sacerdotal authority and powers, their cause was infallibly lost. For, then, it will undeniably follow, that men who were no authorized priests, but laymen, might administer the outward form of baptism, so far valid as not to need repeating. For it cannot be denied that the baptisms given by these ancient heretics, who were no authorized priests by the discipline of the ancient Church, but unauthorized laymen, were, notwithstanding, received by the Church without rebaptization. The consequence of which is very plain, that then the ancient Church, all except the Cyprianists, did receive the baptisms of those whom she esteemed to be no priests: and it matters not what names they were called by, whether unauthorized priests or unauthorized laymen; for it is not names we are disputing about, but the authority and powers of the men, who took upon them to administer the outward form of baptism. If they had not the Church's authority and power, they were not the Church's priests: and if they were not the Church's priests, they were no priests of God. If the Church discarded them from all ministerial authority and power, from all sacerdotal office and function, as she certainly did, then they might call themselves priests, and pretend to the rights, and authority, and commission of priests still; but the Church made no other account of them, but as of nominal or false priests, or of uncommissioned priests, divested of all authority and commission, and reduced to the state of laymen.

If these things stand good, as I am confident they will with all impartial and unprejudiced men, by the strength of the evidences in the foregoing discourse, then there is an end of the dispute between me and this gentleman, about the sense and practice of the ancient Church, relating to the administration of the outward form of baptism by unauthorized and uncommissioned persons. For if heretics, who lose their commission which they once had, be as much unauthorized thenceforward as any layman who never had a commission, their case, as to actual sacerdotal authority and power, is then the same. And if their baptisms were received

Digitized by Google

by the ancient Church only by imposition of hands or confirmation; that is, by completing what was deficient for want of authority, not repeating what was actually done, though without authority; then it must be owned, that the baptisms given by persons who had no actual authority or commission, call them what you please, uncommissioned priests or uncommissioned laymen, were received by the ancient Catholic Church without rebaptization. Which is the thing I have undertaken to shew against Dr. Brett and this author; and I hope I have done it with as good proofs as the nature of a historical subject is capable of, to the evidence of a demonstration. And if either of them can bring better proofs for their assertions than I have done for mine, they shall not fail to have my assent upon rational conviction. Only I desire now they would observe their own rules, and stick to the conditions they impose upon me; that is, give us the sense of the Church from her public acts, from her general and provincial councils, as I now have done, and not from any dark and ambiguous expressions of private writers.

I also desire they would not dispute any more about words, nor charge me with contradictions where there are none. To avoid which beforehand, I think fit to obviate two exceptions, which I know they will be inclined to make, as if I had contradicted myself upon this subject.

The first is, that in the former part of my Scholastical History I have said, that the usurped baptism of laymen was not decreed to be valid by the determination of any general council; and now I pretend to prove, that the baptism of heretics and schismatics is but the baptism of laymen, by the determination of all the general councils; which carries the face and appearance of a contradiction. But this will easily be cleared among wise and ingenuous men, by distinguishing the several acceptations of the word 'laymen;' which may be taken either, first, for Catholic laymen, who never had any pretence to sacerdotal authority or commission in the Church: or, secondly, for heretical laymen, who pretended to have a sacerdotal commission, when they really had none; such as I have shewed the Novatians to be in the ancient Church: or, thirdly, for such laymen as once

Digitized by Google

had a true sacerdotal commission, but were afterward deprived of their commission by the same power of the Church which first gave it, and so were reduced to the state and condition of laymen again. Such laymen were all the ancient heretics and schismatics that had received a legal ordination in the Church, but afterward were deprived of their authority and commission, for their crimes, their obstinacy, and rebellion, by the Church's censures. Such laymen, our author confesses, all heretics and schismatics were made by the discipline of the Cyprianic Churches; and such laymen, I say, they were made by the discipline of the Church universal in all ages. Now, when I said before, that the usurped baptism of laymen was not decreed to be valid by the determination of any general council, I spake of laymen, in the first sense, in the vulgar and common acceptation, as denoting laymen in the Church, who lay no claim to sacerdotal powers peculiar to the clergy of the Church. And I do not yet remember any general council that has directly determined any thing for or against the validity of baptism administered by such laymen. But, in the second sense, I think the Council of Nice has determined the validity of laymen's baptism, because she received the baptism of the Novatian heretics, who pretended to have a true sacerdotal commission, when they really had none. And in the third sense I have shewed, that several general councils admitted of the baptism of laymen, because they admitted of the baptism of heretics, whom they themselves deprived of all sacerdotal authority and commission, and reduced to the quality of laymen. So that there is no contradiction in all this, when matters are rightly adjusted and distinguished.

The other exception I would obviate against beforehand, is in relation to what I have said about heretical priests, in determining whether they be priests or laymen. In the first part of the Scholastical History, I asserted, that heretical priests were, in some sense, allowed to be priests, and their ordination to be valid, even after degradation. The meaning of which I explained to be this, that if they were once truly ordained, the Church did not intend by her censures so far to cancel or annul their ordination, as to make

Digitized by Google

it necessary, when she recalled them to their office, again to give them a new ordination. And thus far I still allow the character of a priest, degraded for heresy by the censures of the Church, to be indelible; that is, that the Church, upon his repentance, needs not give him a new ordination. But I did not intend hereby to say, that heretical priests could not be legally deprived of the authority, and power, and commission of priests; or, that the Church never so deprived them; or, that when they were actually so deprived of all authority and commission, they had still the authority of God and the Church, and were in actual commission, as lawful priests, to baptize, or perform any other sacerdotal acts, notwithstanding their deprivation. And, therefore, when I assert in this book that heretics were deprived of all authority and commission actually by the Church, and during their heresy denied all sacerdotal powers, as much as any other laymen; I take this to be no contradiction to what I said before, but fairly consistent with it, in the understanding of any intelligent and unprejudiced reader. And, therefore, I desire our author not to multiply disputes about hard terms, with a design to involve and cloud my discourse under pretence of contradictions, but to consider fairly what I have now offered, from the ancient discipline of the Church, to prove that heretics may be deprived of all sacerdotal authority, commission, and power; and that they were actually so deprived by the rules of all the ancient councils, which yet allowed the validity of their baptisms so far as not to repeat them by rebaptization. If this author can shew, either, first, that the baptisms of heretics were rejected universally, by the unanimous vote of all the ancient councils; or, secondly, that those heretics, whose baptisms were received, were true priests of God, in actual commission and authority when they baptized, and not reduced to the condition of laymen by the censures of the Church; then I will own he has the truth of ancient history on his side. But if he can fairly make out neither of these things, then my assertions will stand good; first, that the ancient Church did receive the baptism of such heretics as received it in due form: secondly, that those heretics were not

Digitized by Google

reputed to be true priests of God, but destitute of sacerdotal authority and commission, when they administered such baptisms: and that, therefore, thirdly, the baptisms of persons destitute of sacerdotal authority and commission, when they administered them, were received by the Catholic Church without rebaptization. These are the things I assert and maintain; and this author may now try his skill in ecclesiastical history, to prove them to be otherwise.

Our author owns, that this was the principle and discipline of all the Cyprianic Churches, that heretics and schismatics were deprived of their authority and commission, and thenceforward not to be reputed priests, but laymen: they had no regard to the modern notion of the pretended indelible character of priests, but thought, that if priests did things unworthy of their character, their sacerdotal authority and commission might then legally, by the power of the Church, be taken from them: and thence they concluded, that the baptisms of heretics and schismatics were null and void, because they were given by persons who had lost their sacerdotal authority and commission. Now, I say, the Catholic Church entirely agreed with the Cyprianists in their principle and discipline, that heretics were actually deprived of all sacerdotal authority and commission by the authentic power of the Church, and her legal censures. But she differed from them in the inference or conclusion which they deduced from it: for whereas the Cyprianists said, the baptism of heretics is null and void, because heretics are deprived of that sacerdotal authority and commission which, perhaps, they once might have had from the Church, and were now not priests, but laymen;—the Catholic Church concluded otherwise, that though heretics were truly deprived of sacerdotal authority and commission by the censures and authority of the Church, yet the baptisms, given by them in that state, were not wholly null and void, if given in due form, nor so far invalid as to need the outward form to be repeated by rebaptization. The difference was not in their principle, it is plain then, nor in their discipline about heretical priests, but in the different conclusions they drew from it: the one said, The baptisms of heretical priests were

Digitized by Google

null; the other said, They were not null; whilst they both agreed in this, that heretics were not true priests of God, but deprived of all sacerdotal authority and commission by the discipline and authority of the Church.

It is plain, now, to any ordinary capacity, that if matters stood thus in the Catholic Church, she must needs receive the baptisms of persons destitute of sacerdotal authority and commission; for they could not have a Divine commission, when God and his Church agreed to take it from them: and if they had no commission, they were not true priests, however they might sometimes equivocally bear the name and title; which are not the things we are disputing about, but the qualifications and authority of the persons. For let them be called priests or laymen, they were certainly men destitute of a commission, when all sacerdotal authority was taken from them. And if the Church received the baptisms of such men, it is evident she received the baptisms of unauthorized and uncommissioned persons; who were destitute of a commission, not because they were originally without it, as other laymen, though some heretics might be so, but because they were deprived of it by the just powers and discipline of the Church. This I have fully proved against Dr. Brett; and I reckon it a sufficient answer to any thing this author has pretended to offer further concerning the sense and practice of the ancient Church, who makes no new discoveries, but only represents things with a little more artifice, and that not always the most laudable, as will appear in the sequel of this discourse.

Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER II.

### CONTAINING REMARKS ON OUR AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

SECT. I. — *The Unauthorized Baptisms and Invalid Baptisms are not of the same Import in the Sense of the Ancient Church.*

HAVING shewed our author's grand mistake, in supposing all the ancient heretics to be true priests in actual commission, against all the discipline of the ancient Church; I now proceed to make such remarks on the remaining part of his preface and book, as shall seem necessary to set matters in a just light to every candid and unprejudiced reader. In page 3 of his preface, he is offended that I charge him with a great error in confounding the terms of unauthorized baptism and invalid baptism together: and for any thing he has said to clear himself, I still charge him with the same error, in going against the sense of the ancient Church, who distinguished between unauthorized baptisms and invalid baptisms, and reckoned many baptisms to be unauthorized, which she did not esteem invalid: particularly the baptisms of heretics, who had no actual commission, as authorized priests, when she had taken away their commission from them: those baptisms she esteemed unauthorized, but not invalid, so as to need repeating by rebaptization. And our author must first shew, that heretics were true authorized priests by the discipline of the ancient Church, and in actual commission at the time they pretended to baptize, before he will clear himself of the error I charge upon him. For it is not sufficient to say they once had a true commission, unless he also shew that they had never lost their commission, by being deprived of it by the censures of the Church. For if they had lost their commission at the time they pretended to baptize, they were as much unauthorized as those who never had any commission at all. And yet the Church received the unauthorized baptisms of these unauthorized men, and did not pronounce them wholly null



Digitized by Google

and void, but received the persons, so baptized by them, without rebaptization. Which shews that unauthorized baptism and invalid baptism were not terms of the same import in the sense of the ancient Church, however our author is pleased to make them so, which is the thing I charge upon him.

SECT. II. — *This Author's Reasons for the Validity of Heretical Baptism very different from those of the Primitive Church.*

In the next place (page 6), he complains, "That the rest of the Churches in the world would not concur with Cyprian, nor agree with him, to make frustrate and void, during their heresy and schism, the commissions once received by their heretical and schismatical subjects." This grand charge against the universal Church I have already shewed to be a grand mistake: for all the Churches in the world did thus far concur with Cyprian, as to make frustrate and void the commissions of heretics and schismatics, during their heresy and schism: only they did not conclude with him, that therefore the baptisms of heretics are absolutely invalid, and to be repeated again, as being given by persons out of commission; which was a wrong inference of Cyprian's, in which the Catholic Church never would concur with him. But our author is very confident, that the reason why the Churches, differing from Cyprian, did not make void the baptisms given by heretics, was only because those Churches had no laws to take away the sacerdotal commission of heretics from them. Which is not only said without proof, but against the glaring evidence of so many laws of general and provincial councils; which I have now produced, to shew that the Church abounded with such laws, which were actually put in execution upon heretics upon every proper occasion, vacating their commissions, and taking away all sacerdotal authority from them. And I am amazed to think, how any man could converse with ancient councils, and not observe this, which almost occurs in every page of them.

Digitized by Google

SECT. III.— *This Author's Notion about the Invalidity of Heretical Baptism unbaptizes the whole Church of England.*

But for all this, our author will still have it, that the validity of heretical baptism depended upon heretics having a true commission, not vacated or taken away during their heresy or schism. For these are his words (page 7): "Those Churches held such baptisms to be valid in themselves, as to their ministration, and so do I too, because there was no want of commission." Now, if I rightly understand him, this is as much as to say, that if heretics have not a commission, their baptism is invalid. I cannot see but that by our principles it must be so. And, therefore, unless he can shew that the ancient heretics and schismatics had a lawful and unvacated commission, during their heresy or schism, he must needs conclude their baptism was invalid. And then I will venture to say again, that such notions concerning the invalidity of heretical and schismatical baptism, do unchurch and unbaptize the whole Church of England, however angry our author is for bringing so heavy a charge against him. He says, I should have named his black notions in his own words. And I did so in my remarks upon him, page 153,[a] &c. But if he was pleased to overlook it, that was his fault, and not mine.

Now the charge was this: that he had then declared himself freely for the Cyprianic notion of the invalidity of heretical and schismatical baptism; and withal declared, that the baptisms of the Church of Rome were the baptisms of a Church that was overrun with abundance of damnable doctrines and practices, and had but little of solid or substantial religion to be found in her communion. Upon which I told him plainly, that if the baptisms of heretics and schismatics were invalid, and the Church of Rome were a heretical and schismatical Church; and the Church of England had her baptisms originally from that Church, and no other; that then the consequence must be, that all the

[a] See Appendix to the First Part, p. 312, in the present edition.

Digitized by Google

baptisms of the Church of England were invalid, and that there was no true baptism administered by her priests, any more than by any others. Now, to free himself from this charge, he thinks fit to say, "He believes the baptism of heretics to be valid in such Churches as did not, by their discipline, vacate or take away the commission of heretics from them." But then I tell him his supposition is utterly false: there were anciently no such Churches as left heretics and schismatics in possession of their authority and commission; and I have proved my assertion by as undeniable evidences as can be given: and therefore, till he disproves them, and proves his own supposition by stronger evidences, the charge I bring against him, must rest upon him; and, whether he will repent of and retract his unchurching principles or not, I see yet no reason to take off the just reproach which is laid upon him. I can be as civil to his person as he desires; but if he advances such false assertions and positions, as reproach the universal Church and the Church of England together, he must excuse me, if I think myself, in common justice, bound to shew him his mistakes, and with some reflection on his principles do justice to our common Mother.

SECT. IV.—*The Exceptions of our Author against the new Form of Confirmation, which was proposed to the Convocation, considered.*

His next exceptions are, pages 8 and 9, against the proposal I humbly offered to our superiors, legally assembled in convocation, concerning a peculiar form of confirmation for such as were baptized by heretics and schismatics. He hopes our superiors will distinguish between such heretics as received an episcopal commission and those that never had one. I think neither he nor I need direct our superiors what is fit and proper to be done in this case. But I will make bold to tell him again, that if heretics lose their commission which they once had; if their commission be vacated by the censures of the Church, and taken from them by the same authority that gave it; then their sacerdotal authority and powers are not so vastly different from those

Digitized by Google

who never had a commission, as he imagines. For he himself owns, that a commission once received, and afterwards vacated, was reduced to an equality with a no-commission never received at all, by the discipline of the Cyprianic Churches. And I have made it appear, that this was the case of the ancient heretics, by the discipline of all Churches. So that whatever forms of confirmation were made for persons baptized by those heretics, must needs be for persons baptized by such men as had no actual commission, but antiquated, vacated, and taken from them. And where, then, is the mighty difference between such a vacated commission, and no commission at all? But our author cannot yet believe, that the ancient heretics had their commissions so vacated and taken from them by any other beside the Cyprianic Churches. He had best, therefore, inquire a little further into this matter, and give himself and the world a little more rational satisfaction, before he is too dogmatical and peremptory in directing his superiors, and fixing distinctions to be rules to their proceedings.

But he has a pleasant exception behind, against the form of confirmation which I subjoined as an exemplar. He says, "It was only the product of the ninth century, and wants the noble character of what is catholic, that is, antiquity, universality, and consent." I am a little at a loss here to know what this gentleman would have, especially when he adds, "That I might, with as much reason, have given an instance of image-worship and invocation of saints from the second Council of Nice." But why so much anger against an innocent form of prayer? Or why, to make it answer the end for which I proposed it, must it needs have antiquity, universality, and consent? Have we now any apostolical liturgies? Or any particular forms of prayer, except the Lord's prayer and some few others in Scripture, which may pretend to this noble character and a general reception over all the Church in all ages? A man may as reasonably object against some of our Common Prayers, that they are taken out of the Mass-Book, as this author does against this form, because it is only fetched from the ninth century; when every one knows, prayers of the same sense and kind, though

Digitized by Google

not of the same length and words, may be found among the first orders that were made by general Councils for the reception of those that were baptized by heretics, into the communion of the Church. But if our author is not more sparing in such objections as these, I shall be obliged to be a little more sparing in my answers.

SECT. V. — *Our Author confesses his Mistake in producing Lucifer as a Witness against Lay-Baptism.*

In page 11, we have something more candid and ingenuous from him. He confesses he made an undesigned slip when he mistook a minor proposition for a major; and therefore brought Lucifer upon the stage as a witness for the invalidity of lay-baptism, and St. Jerome as asserting the same, by the authority of the Nicene Council. He civilly thanks me for helping him to correct these mistakes: and I hope I shall have his thanks again for setting him right once more about the priesthood and commission of heretics and schismatics, when I shew him that it was vacated and taken from them, during their heresy and schism, by the universal consent and votes of the whole Catholic Church. After which, I shall have no longer occasion to dispute with him about unauthorized or uncommissioned baptism, from the history of the Church: since all the world will own, that a vacated commission and a no-commission are pretty near a parallel. And if the Church received the baptisms of those as valid, whose commission she had vacated, she might as well receive the baptisms of those who never had any commission at all, because they were both actually and equally without commission, when they pretended to baptize; the one, as never having had any commission; the other, as having lost their commission by the Church's censures.

SECT. VI.—*How our Author confounds Valid Baptism and Saving Baptism together.*

But our author alters his style in the same page, and, instead of thanks, charges me with captiousness and cavilling, only because I desired to know, in what writing of

Digitized by Google

the Stephanians he found this maintained, that they who had received baptism from heretics or schismatics, were in a state of salvation. He says, "Any one who has looked into Cyprian's works, must know that Stephen, bishop of Rome, did hold that such baptized persons were in a state of salvation, for they esteemed them to have been validly baptized: and sure they who held men to have been validly baptized, esteemed them to have been in a state of salvation: otherwise what signified the validity of their baptism?" To which I answer, without captiousness or cavilling, That it signified thus much, that they were not to be rebaptized, when they came over to the Catholic Church: but it did not signify, that they were in a state of salvation, while they continued in heresy or schism: for these things are very different from one another. St. Austin, and all the Catholic Church, defended the validity of heretical baptism against the Donatists: but they did not tell them or any other heretics, that therefore they were in a state of salvation while they were heretics, because they had a valid baptism: for then it had been in vain to exhort them to come over to the Catholic Church in order to be saved. So that unless Pope Stephen had some very peculiar notion of the salvability of heretics, different from the rest of the Church, he could not be of the opinion our author fathers upon him, for there is no consequence in our author's proof. Stephen believed the baptism of heretics to be valid: *ergo*, he believed heretics to be in a state of salvation. For men may have valid baptism, and yet be in a state of damnation, as heretics out of the Church, and such wicked men as Simon Magus in the Church: which is so plain, that I will not stand longer to dispute it with our author, but leave it to the reader to judge who is the most cavilling person; I who distinguish valid baptism from saving baptism, with all the ancients; or he who, to make good his charge against Pope Stephen, thus admirably confounds different things together.

Digitized by Google

## SECT. VII.—*That Heretical Baptism is properly Anti-episcopal, by our Author's own Concessions.*

I here pass over two or three things, as not worth disputing any longer about them: as whether Athanasius was represented, by our author, to be of Cyprian's opinion; and what number of bishops there were in the Council of Arles, thirty-three or two hundred: and pass on to a more material question, Whether the baptism of heretical bishops was not esteemed the baptism of false bishops or no-bishops, and all their ministrations reckoned anti-episcopal? Our author says (page 15), "I must needs know that the Novatians, and other heretics and schismatics, began their heresies and schisms in episcopacy." But I am so far from knowing this, that I hope to make our author know the contrary: for I have made it more than probable, in the foregoing discourse (chap. ii.), that Novatian himself, the first founder of the Novatians, was never truly ordained a bishop, but his ordination was declared null and void by the Catholic Church, *ab origine:* because, though he had three bishops to give him a pretended ordination, yet it was done in such a manner, against so many standing rules of the Catholic Church, that the Church declared it a void ordination from the very first; and he was never admitted into the college of bishops, but esteemed a false bishop, a counterfeit bishop, a no-bishop, from the beginning. By our author's own rules, then, he could be no true bishop, because the Catholic Church declared him to be a false one. Our author says further, "That those first heretical and schismatical bishops so ordained, had not their orders nulled and voided by those Churches that allowed their baptisms." But I have evidently proved the contrary to a demonstration, that those heretical and schismatical bishops had their commissions repealed and vacated, not only by the Cyprianic Churches, which annulled their baptisms, but by the Roman Churches, and the whole Catholic Church, and the bishops of the whole world, who allowed their baptisms to be valid, so far as not to need repeating. They took away their commissions and authority from them, and declared them to be

Digitized by Google

false bishops, counterfeit bishops, and no-bishops. And though they called themselves bishops, yet they were really no-bishops in the eye of the Church; because she had taken away their commissions, and reduced them, by her own authority, to the state of laymen. Our author owns the Church had such a power to vacate their commissions, and that the Cyprianic Churches did actually exercise this power upon them: in which case he allows, that heretical bishops were unbishoped, by being deprived of their commissions by the discipline of those Churches, and reduced plainly to a state of laymen. Now, I have proved to him further, that this same power was claimed and actually exercised by all the Churches in the world against heretical bishops; that they did deprive them of their commissions, divest them of their authority, take away all episcopal and sacerdotal power from them, and then declare them henceforward to be no bishops nor priests, but in the state of laymen. So that upon this supposition, that their commissions were vacated and taken from them, it follows, upon our author's own principles and concessions, that these heretical bishops were no longer true authorized and commissioned bishops or priests of God, but uncommissioned laymen; being deprived, by the authority of the Catholic Church, of that commission which they once were possessed of.

And now let our author, or any other man, judge, whether the baptisms of these heretics and schismatics were not, upon this supposition, the baptisms of no-priests and anti-episcopal baptisms, and the baptisms of unauthorized and uncommissioned laymen. I do not say laymen that never had a commission, that our author may not quibble; but men that were actually deprived of their commission by the bishops of the Church, and set themselves up against bishops, after they were reduced to the state of laymen. If such baptisms were not anti-episcopal, I know not what anti-episcopal means; or what are uncommissioned baptisms, if the baptisms of these men were not uncommissioned, when their commission was taken from them. Our author now will not pretend to take sanctuary, as some of his friends do, in that bold assertion against the authority of

Digitized by Google

the Church, that a priest is a true priest still, in authority, let the Church do what she will to take his commission from him, and bring him back to the state of a layman. For our author owns, the Church both has and ought to have such a power; and that the Cyprianic Churches did actually exercise this power upon heretics by their discipline, vacating the commissions of heretical bishops and priests, and leaving them destitute of all sacerdotal authority in the condition of laymen: so that the only question remaining between this author and me is, Whether the rest of the Churches of the world did actually exercise the same power against heretical bishops and priests? For if they did, they plainly made them laymen: and, then, if any of those laymen set up against their bishops, or the college of bishops, pretending to baptize without regaining a commission from them,—their baptisms, in that case, must needs be anti-episcopal baptisms, the baptisms of false priests or no-priests; as having no commission, but a vacated and repealed one, and the baptisms of unauthorized and uncommissioned laymen. I would speak as plainly as I can upon this head, because the whole of our dispute depends upon this single point: and, if our author will fairly try it out, we will lay aside all other debates, and stick to this, and let truth prevail on that side which appears to have the clearest evidences and strongest reasons. It is a question of fact and history, that may easily be decided by the public records of the Church, the acts of her general and provincial councils in all ages, which contain her proceedings against heretics; whereby it may easily be discovered whether she vacated the commission of heretics, and took their sacerdotal authority from them or not. If she did not vacate their commission, then I will yield the cause to this author: but if I have made it appear that she did vacate their commission and deprive them of all sacerdotal authority, then I expect he will as civilly give up the cause to me, that the ancient heretics were not true bishops and priests in lawful commission, but anti-episcopal usurpers, acting without and against the commission of the true bishops of the Church: and that their baptisms, consequently, were not the bap-

Digitized by Google

tisms of true commissioned priests, but the baptisms of anti-episcopal, uncommissioned, unauthorized laymen, made such by the Church's censures. And I desire no more to be allowed me, to prove that the ancient Catholic Church received as valid, without rebaptizing, such baptisms as were given in due form, by men who, at the time of baptizing, had lost their commission; and were not then true priests of God in actual commission, but, at that instant, unauthorized and uncommissioned laymen.

Sect. VIII.—*That our Author's Charge upon his Adversaries, of dissolving the Necessity of the Christian Priesthood, equally reflects upon the Principles and Practice of the whole Catholic Church in all Ages.*

I shall but make one observation more upon our author's long preface, and that is the sting in the close of it. "To conclude my long preface," says he, "I leave this with our reverend historian, as he is a clergyman, and do affirm, that it is a proposition very easy to be proved against any man whatsoever, that if baptism performed by persons, who were never really and truly commissioned by bishops to baptize, and who act herein rebelliously against, and in opposition to, the Divine right of episcopacy, be good and valid baptism; then authoritative preaching, administering the other sacrament, the power of excommunicating, of binding and loosing, of retaining and absolving men's sins, and all the spiritual functions of the clergy, are also good and valid, when attempted by unauthorized, never commissioned lay-persons. The consequence of which is the utter dissolution and taking away the necessity of the Christian priesthood,—therefore of Christ's authority here on earth,—and so of all revealed religion too; which is a dreadful consideration: and much more so, if any, who ought to be the guardians of these sacred things, should endeavour, by their writings and preaching, to establish the dangerous premises from whence such profane consequences do naturally flow."

Our author had done much better to have proved this solidly, than to have barely said it, and threatened what he could do: for no one will believe him, but only those who

Digitized by Google

take every thing upon his word, merely because he says it. Let the consideration be as dreadful as it will, I not only say, but have proved to our author, that it neither affects me, nor the bishops of the present Church, who are most of them involved in the same accusation, any more than it does the whole Catholic Church, which allowed the validity of heretical baptism, at the same time that she deprived heretics of their sacerdotal commission, and esteemed them really and truly no more priests during their heresy, though they once had a commission, than the most unauthorized layman, who never had any commission at all. And, therefore, with a little variation of necessary terms, I shall draw up his accusation against the Primitive Church, as near as may be in his own words: "If baptism,—performed by persons, who are really and truly deprived of their commission to baptize by the bishops of the Catholic Church, and who act, after such deprivation, rebelliously against, and in opposition to, the Divine right of episcopacy,—be good and valid baptism, as the ancient Church asserted; then authoritative preaching, administering the other sacrament, the power of excommunicating, of binding and loosing, of retaining and absolving men's sins, and all the spiritual functions of the clergy, are also good and valid, when attempted by unauthorized priests, whom the Church makes laymen by depriving them of their commission: the consequence of which is, the utter dissolution, and taking away, of the necessity of the Christian priesthood,—therefore of Christ's authority here on earth,—and so of all revealed religion too." Now, if this rant of an argument would only be reckoned an insignificant slander in any one that should level it against the known practice of the Primitive Church in allowing the baptism of heretics to be valid, when they were deprived of their commission by the same power that first gave it; I leave every one to judge what name the same accusation deserves, when brought against others, who are only relating and defending the practice of the ancient and present Church against the pretensions of modern innovators. Our author will not pretend there is any great difference between a vacated commission once received

Digitized by Google

and a no-commission never received at all; for as to actual authority it is equally wanting in both: but he will still say, the Primitive Church never vacated the commission of those heretics whose baptism she received as valid: which, when he has said it over a thousand times, will be no nearer truth, but a grand mistake of his own, or some others, who abused his credulity in informing him so: and the more he repeats it, the more he will only abuse himself and the world in echoing forth their wrong information.

I could say a great deal more to shew the weakness and absurdity of this his insinuation. But what I have already said is sufficient, with all wise and good men, to vindicate the guardians of sacred things from so vile an aspersion, which reflects so much dishonour on his lawful superiors, and so much reproach on the ancient Catholic Church: — with whom I take it to be an honour to be reproached by this author, only for advancing the same principles as the Catholic Church did; which he falsely charges with the consequence of dissolving all revealed religion, and the necessity of the Christian priesthood: as if there were no necessity of lawful priests, because there may be some usurpers; some heretics that have lost their commission, and some that never had a commission; whose baptisms can confer no graces of the Spirit, for which there is a necessity of lawful priests, but may give the outer form in such a manner as the Church thinks fit not to repeat by rebaptization. Let him declaim as long and as loud against this as he pleases, and call it a dissolving of the necessity of the Christian priesthood: it is only what I expected at his hands, who insults the Fathers of his Church with contempt and scorn, and, under the professions of respect to priests, treats all those rudely who are not his followers and admirers. All I shall say further at present, upon this head, to this accuser of the brethren, is only, "The Lord rebuke thee!"

Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER III.

### REMARKS ON OUR AUTHOR'S FIRST AND SECOND CHAPTERS.

SECT. I.—*That the allowing the Baptisms of Usurpers to be valid, is not abetting or encouraging their Usurpations.*

HAVING thus far copiously considered our author's preface, I shall be more sparing upon his book, because the main controversy about uncommissioned baptism is already determined. Our author's first chapter is spent in a sharp invective against the usurpers of sacerdotal powers, and the abettors and encouragers of those usurpations. In which I know no one that has engaged in the present controversy, to be really concerned, though he would gladly insinuate and fasten the charge upon them. He begins his book by telling his readers, "That the occasion of it is a most novel and unchristian usurpation, attempted at the Reformation, and since that time to this day, by men who never received any Divine commission; and who yet, in opposition to, and rebellion against, their spiritual sovereigns, refusing to receive any such commission from them, endeavour to advance themselves into the high-priest's and priest's office, and to minister in such holy things as God has appropriated to that sacred commission, which he gives to men for that purpose. And this they do, not upon the pretence of necessity, arising, as some suppose, from the want of such as are commissioned, but in an obstinate, perverse resistance against Christ's spiritual vicegerents, undervaluing and trampling upon that authority wherewith he has invested them."

Now, whatever there may be in this accusation, it affects most his own friends, I mean those who hold the same opinions with our author about rebaptizing, that is, the followers of Cartwright in England, and the Calvinists beyond sea: for we of the Church of England, are not concerned in any such pretended usurpation. "Yes," our author says, "we adhere to and encourage them in their usurpations;

Digitized by Google

we concur with and abet them, because we affirm there is some validity in such pretended ministrations." But if this were to be called abetting or encouraging men's usurpations, I could much more plausibly prove our author guilty of abetting and encouraging heretics and schismatics; for he maintains that the baptism of the ancient heretics and schismatics was not only good and valid, but ministered with as good authority and Divine commission as that of the Catholic priests: which assertion puts those usurpers upon an equal foot and level with the true priests of God, and the authorized baptizers of the Church, when yet I have evidently proved, that the ancient heretics were all of them destitute of commission and anti-episcopal usurpers. Again, if there be any force in his accusation, then, First, it holds equally against all the Church of England, and her whole college of bishops ever since the Reformation, who have constantly admitted such as were baptized by these usurpers, without giving them a new baptism. So that if, allowing the bare validity of their baptism be an abetting and encouraging of usurpers, the whole Church of England has been involved in this crime from the beginning of the Reformation. Secondly, his accusation holds equally against the Primitive Church, for allowing the validity of the baptisms of the Novatians, who were not only deprived of their commission as heretics, but originally destitute of episcopal commission, having, as I have proved, never received a true episcopal ordination. Thirdly, it involves the whole Primitive Church in the same crime of abetting or encouraging usurpers, because she allowed the validity of the baptisms of those heretics, whom she deprived of their commission by her own authority, and esteemed them no priests after that, but mere usurpers. For these men, only changing the terms, "Having never received a Divine commission," into, "Being deprived of their Divine commission," were as liable to the character which our author gives of unchristian usurpers, as those against whom he levels it: "For they were deprived of their Divine commission; and yet in opposition to, and rebellion against, their spiritual sovereigns, they endeavoured to advance them-

Digitized by Google

selves into the high-priest's and priest's office, and to minister in such holy things as God had appropriated to that sacred commission, which he gives to men for that purpose; and this they did, not upon the pretence of necessity, arising from the want of such as are commissioned, but in an obstinate, perverse resistance against Christ's spiritual vicegerents, undervaluing and trampling upon that authority wherewith he has invested them." These heretics, after they were deprived of all Divine commission by Christ's spiritual vicegerents, without receiving any other commission from them, in opposition to, and rebellion against, them, took upon them the sacerdotal office of baptizing, without authority, and against authority; and yet the Primitive Church received the baptisms of these usurpers as valid, so far as not to repeat the outward form by rebaptization. Now, then, according to our author's way of arguing, the Primitive Church was guilty of abetting and encouraging heretical and schismatical usurpers, because she so far allowed the validity of their baptisms. But if this be a slander upon the Primitive Church, then it is equally so upon all those who maintain the validity of usurpers' baptism, no further than the Primitive Church did; who put no sacerdotal authority into the hands of heretics and schismatics, as our author does, but take it away from them; who ascribe no spiritual effects to heretical or unauthorized baptisms, but call upon men to reconcile themselves to the Church, in order to be made partakers of grace and salvation. This is not to abet or encourage heretics, or schismatics, or usurpers, but to lay the due weight and load of their crimes upon them; to condemn their usurpations, to deny their authority, and exhort them to forsake a bad and unauthorized way, and return to the true authorized and effectual way of the Church. Which shews how much our author overshot himself in his zeal, when he went about to form such a groundless and false accusation against his innocent brethren, that reflects dishonour upon the Church of England, and the whole Catholic Church; and even upon himself too, who stands up for the sacerdotal authority of those heretics whom the ancient Church declared to be no

Digitized by Google

priests, but usurpers. And this is the only observation and remark I have occasion to make upon this first chapter.

He begins his second chapter with saying, "That I grant the thing disputed as a divine, but deny it as a historian, because I say, a power or commission to authorize men to baptize was necessary to preserve the Church according to the order of Christ in future ages." This author has a notable talent of finding out contradictions, where there are none. For wherein do I make my divinity and history contradict one another? If it was the order of Christ, that there should be a standing ministry in his Church authorized to baptize, then it was necessary there should be some persons still in commission to authorize such a ministry to baptize: this I call observing the order or rule which Christ has appointed in his Church, to preserve it with such an authorized standing ministry in it. But, now, if some men, who are not authorized, take upon them to baptize without commission, and the Church thinks fit not to repeat the outward form of baptism given by such usurpers; does that make it unnecessary, either that there should be a standing authorized ministry, or that there should be those who have commission to authorize others, because a valid baptism may be given, so far as concerns the outward form, sometimes by a usurper? I believe the Primitive Church understood the order of Christ as well as any of us: but yet she did not think, because she admitted the baptisms of heretics and schismatics, who were destitute of a commission, that, therefore, there was no necessity of a standing authorized ministry, or of persons in commission to authorize others to baptize according to the order of Christ, because there were some that baptized without the authority of the Church, and so against his order:—but she thought these two things might consist together. The outward form of baptism, administered sometimes by unauthorized persons, did not destroy the general necessity of a standing authorized ministry in the Church:—so that whatever contradiction our author fancies in my accounts, as a historian and a divine, will unavoidably fall as much upon the Catholic Church, and an equal charge be brought against her judgment on the



Digitized by Google

one hand, and her practice on the other. And in such society, I shall not be concerned to fall under our author's censure.

Sect. II. — *That some Discretionary Power was supposed to be in the Hands of Bishops in Commissioning Persons to Baptize.*

His next discourse against the author under the name of St. Ambrose (page 6), I pass over; because, as I laid no stress upon him before, so I intend to multiply no disputes about him. But our author says (page 10), "That I found the principle of bishops' power to authorize laymen to baptize, upon the pretended relation of that author." Which is a wrong information, that may perhaps satisfy such of his readers as intend to read his book and not mine; but it will satisfy no others: for I found nothing upon the fact as related by that author, but only say, the ancients went upon the same principles; which I prove another way. My words are these: "Though no other writer among the ancients has so plainly expressed his mind upon this point, as this author under the name of St. Ambrose; yet it is plain, all of them, who maintained the power of bishops to authorize deacons and laymen to baptize, or, at their discretion, to restrain them from it, must needs go upon the same principle, viz. that such a power was lodged in the hands of the bishops of the Church, as the apostles' successors, to authorize what men should baptize, and in what cases, according as they should think necessary in their wisdom and discretion, for the greater or lesser exigencies of the Church: and I there give this reason for it, because without this principle it will be impossible to account for the practice of the ancient bishops, who sometimes restrained deacons from baptizing as well as laymen, and sometimes granted authority to them both."—Scholast. Hist. p. 5. Now, our author had done much better, if he had accounted for those practices of the ancients some other way, since he did not like the account which I gave, rather than criticise upon mine so causelessly and to so little purpose.

Digitized by Google

SECT. III.—*Whether Deacons were accounted Priests, and the ordinary and standing Ministers of Baptism?*

But this is not the only false criticism our author is guilty of, in the same place. For he asks immediately, page 3, "Why are deacons here ranked with laymen among those who are not standing ministers to baptize? Did not Mr. Bingham reckon them before as standing ministers?" I answer, No; I only said, they had a commission from the apostles to baptize; but whether that was for ordinary or extraordinary cases, I determined not. Philip's baptizing the eunuch was in an extraordinary case, when no one else could do it: and a commission for such a case does not make a man a standing ordinary minister of baptism; otherwise laymen, who had a commission for extraordinary cases, would have been standing ministers. But he says, page 17, "I was of another opinion when I wrote my *Origines;* for there I call deacons priests, and shew, from Optatus and Dr. Hicks, that bishops, presbyters, and deacons, had all their share in the Christian priesthood." He cites abundance of my words; but he forgets one thing, that I was then delivering the opinion of the ancients on both sides the question, and that I said the opinion of Optatus was not the general and received opinion, but that which prevailed most was,—that they were not priests, but Levites. Here I shall be constrained to transcribe a paragraph in my *Origines,* which our author was pleased to overlook. The very title of it is, "That deacons were not generally called priests, but ministers and Levites;" and the words are as follows: "That I may not seem to impose upon my readers, I must observe, that the name of 'priest' was not generally given to the deacons by those that esteemed them a sacred order; but they are commonly distinguished from priests by the names of 'ministers and Levites.' Thus St. Jerome distinguishes them from the priests of the second order; that is, from the presbyters, by the title of 'Levites.' The author of the Questions upon the Old and New Testament, under the name of St. Austin, and Hilarius Sardus, under the name of St. Ambrose, are more positive and express in denying

Digitized by Google

them the name of 'priests:' *Non sunt sacerdotes.* And Salvian, though he acknowledges their ministration and function to be about holy things, yet he gives them but the same title of 'Levites,' and that in contradistinction to the 'priests.' And so, frequently, in the councils the names *sacerdos* and *Levita* are used, as the peculiar distinguishing titles of 'presbyters and deacons.' The fourth Council of Carthage speaks more expressly, that deacons are not ordained to the priesthood, but only to the ministering office or inferior service, &c. Whence some learned men (Habertus and Bishop Fell) conclude, against Optatus and St. Austin, that deacons were in no sense allòwed to be priests; whilst others (Rigaltius and Dr. Hicks), with Optatus, distinguish the several degrees of the priesthood, and reckon, that though deacons were not absolutely called 'priests,' because that was the appropriate title of bishops and presbyters, whose ministers and attendants they were; yet deacons sometimes performed such offices, as did entitle them to a lower degree of the priesthood. Having thus fairly stated and represented the matter on both sides, I must leave the judicious reader to determine for himself, which opinion has the strongest reasons." So far my *Origines*, book ii. chap. xx. sect. ii. By which the reader may now judge, how far I contradict myself when I say, the ancients did not generally allow deacons to be priests, nor the ordinary ministers of baptism. For it is plain they were divided about these matters, and the greatest part held the negative side of the questions; and so many of them as did not believe deacons to be priests, nor the ordinary ministers of baptism, and yet allowed them, in some cases, to baptize, could not surely think the hand of a priest so indispensably necessary in all cases, as that it could be no baptism, if given by any other person, unless they spake egregious contradictions. But I believe our author takes the words, 'priest and sacerdotal power,' in a larger sense than those ancients did, who distinguished priests from deacons, as our Church does also when she distinguishes the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons: for he makes every man a priest, and invested with sacerdotal powers, who has the bishop's commission to baptize,

Digitized by Google

either in ordinary or extraordinary cases whatsoever. For he says in his preface, page 17, "If there can be any such thing as the giving of a real authority to laymen to baptize, then when authorized they will cease, in that respect, to be laymen, having, if they can have, a sacerdotal power to baptize in want of the clergy; which will make such their baptisms to be sacerdotal, authorized baptisms, and so not properly lay-baptisms."

Now so long as we are thus divided about terms, we are but disputing and wrangling in the dark about 'priest and priesthood,' to no purpose. The ancients commonly mean by a 'priest' a presbyter, who in his ordination receives a sacerdotal power not belonging to a deacon; and the ordinary ministration of baptism is, by most of them, made part of this power. But our author, by a 'priest,' understands any one who has a commission to baptize in any case whatsoever, as well a deacon and a layman (supposing him to have received such a commission), as a presbyter, whom the Church has used to call a priest in opposition to a deacon. And whilst the ancients mean one thing by a 'priest,' and our author another, it is better to dismiss this dispute, and come to something that is more certain,—to take 'priest' in our author's notion; and then inquire, Whether none but a person in commission can administer the outward form of baptism so far valid as not to need to be repeated?

### SECT. IV.—*That many uncommissioned Baptisms were anciently confirmed by Bishops without rebaptizing.*

It is a maxim with our author, page 10, "No power, no baptism; no commission in the administrator, no baptism in the receiver." Upon which he challenges me and all the world, page 11, to produce any instances of such baptisms pretended to be confirmed by bishops, where the commission, which he calls essential, was wanting. Again he repeats his challenge, page 12, "What presbyters among the ancients did ever offer to baptize, as absolute and independent of bishops? Mr. Bingham has not produced any ancient instance of such modern rebels: no, the schismatics

Digitized by Google

of old adhered to, and depended upon, some bishop or other." Now I have answered this challenge, as Providence would have it, before it was made: for I have shewed that the irregularity of the ancient heretics and schismatics consisted in the want of commission: for their commission was taken from them; and then it is all one as if they never had any commission at all: as he that loses his eyes, is as much blind, and without eyes, as he that never had any eyes at all. I have proved this so substantially in the foregoing discourse, that it effectually silences all his little quibbles that follow in the next pages about circumstantial and essential irregularities: for the want of a commission is, according to him, an essential irregularity in a priest or presbyter. But why, then, do I call such an one a presbyter, when he is out of commission? Why, only to give him some name to know him by: for I agree he is no true presbyter, when he is out of commission. And, therefore, it is no such hard matter to come by my meaning, as he pretends it to be, page 14: I mean one who once had the commission of a presbyter, but afterwards was deprived of it for his heresy and schism, by the authority and discipline of the Church, whose act of ministration is sinful in this very act, because now he acts without commission. This is the presbyter I am inquiring about, what validity there was in baptisms administered by him, after he had lost his commission, and set up to act against the authority of his bishop or the Church that had taken his commission from him? He was now no real presbyter, but only in name, because he had lost his commission. How, then, came his baptisms to be reputed valid for all that, when he was unauthorized and uncommissioned? That is my inquiry. And now let our author mistake my meaning again if he can. He must now say, either there never was a heretical or schismatical presbyter so deprived of commission in the ancient Church; or that his baptisms, given after such deprivation, were never received as valid. Either of which will be to purpose, if he can really make them good, against so many evidences, and so authentically attested, as I have given to the contrary. But nothing short of this will signify any thing in the present

Digitized by Google

case, where we are inquiring about the validity of baptisms given by uncommissioned persons.

SECT. V.—*The necessary Distinction of the Ancients between an Authoritative and a merely valid Baptism confounded by our Author.*

Our author's hypothesis will not suffer him to distinguish between an authorized baptism and a mere valid baptism, because he thinks all baptism null and void that is given without authority. But the ancients distinguished betwixt these two sorts of baptism, and reckoned the one to be founded on the lawful authority of the administrator, but the other not so. Therefore our author only trifles and imposes upon himself and his readers, page 16, when he charges me with inconsistencies and contradictions, because when I speak of authoritative baptism, I say the ancients founded it upon a commission; and when I speak of mere valid baptism, I say they did not found it upon sacerdotal powers; because they reckoned the baptism of a heretical or schismatical priest, who was deprived of his commission, to be valid notwithstanding: which things, in the opinion of the ancients, were fairly consistent together. But then he says, page 20, "If I would have done any thing here to the purpose, I should have produced authorities, who allowed of the validity of baptism in the name of the Trinity, administered by heretical, schismatical, and other irregular priests: I should have given a history of such ancients nulling and making void the commission of those priests during their heresy, schism, or other irregularity: but as yet I have given no such instance, and he is confident I never will. For it is notorious, that those ancient Churches, which allowed of the validity of those baptisms, did also acknowledge the holy orders of the baptizers, and esteemed their episcopal ordination to be good and valid." Now the reader will be best judge of this, when he has considered the evidences I have produced in the foregoing discourse, to prove heretics, and schismatics, and degraded priests, to be deprived of their commission; to be no true priests of God in that state of deprivation, but unauthorized and uncommissioned priests,

Digitized by Google

or laymen. The two authorities our author produces, page 21, out of the Council of Nice and the African Codex, are nothing to his purpose: for they do not say, that heretics and schismatics were allowed to be true authorized and commissioned priests, during their heresy or schism; but that they should be admitted to officiate in the clerical state, upon their return to the Church; and then they had the Church's commission, which they had been deprived of during their heresy or schism. And this was only a particular favour allowed to the Novatians and Donatists, by way of indulgence and dispensation with the common rule, which was to keep heretics and schismatics for ever deprived of clerical promotions and sacerdotal powers. But our author, being ignorant of the strictness of discipline in the ancient Church, did not distinguish between her common and ordinary rule, and the particular indulgences and dispensations that were granted in some cases, when the necessities of the Church required her to relax a little of her usual severity and discipline. Which she did in the case of the Novatians and Donatists, to encourage them to return to the unity of the Church; not allowing them to have been true priests, while they were out of the Church, but favouring them with a lawful commission, when they returned into her bosom; which favour was denied generally to other heretics, who still stood deprived of their commission for their former rebellions and oppositions to her, even after they were reconciled, and admitted to lay-communion: of which I have given numerous instances in the foregoing discourse.

It will, therefore, stand good against our author, that those ancient heretics and schismatics were deprived of their commission, during their heresy and schism: and then, according to his own principles and confession, they were no priests in that state, when their commission was taken away by that very authority, that is, the episcopal power which first gave it. I will put the whole issue of the debate upon this single point: for he and I are now well agreed, that the merits of the cause are now contained in it. So that if it appears, that the sacerdotal power and commission of those ancient heretics and schismatics was actually taken from

Digitized by Google

them by the same episcopal power which first gave it; then our author professes he will own, that they were no longer authorized priests by virtue of any indelible or indeleted character remaining in them. For our author in this is more ingenuous and favourable to the Protestant cause than some others: he owns that the character of a priest may be so far deleted or blotted out for his crimes, that all actual power, authority, commission, and rights of a priest, may be taken from him by the same competent power which first invested him with them. And if it be undeniably proved, that this was actually the case of the ancient heretics and schismatics, as I am confident it is proved by the best of evidences in the foregoing discourse, as clear as the sun at noon-day; then the ground of the dispute is entirely at an end; and our author will confess, that baptism was anciently given by such unauthorized and irregular priests as had actually no commission.

And, therefore, for this reason, I will wave at present making any further reflections upon our author's account of ancient history; not because he has said any thing of moment to take off the force of the arguments and authorities I urged to prove my several assertions; but, because the method he and I are now agreed upon, is a more likely and compendious way to terminate this dispute, by bringing matters to a single point, and examining the truth of that by the most public acts and authentic records of the Church. Here we shall have no such great occasion to wrangle about private authors speaking their own private sense: which is our author's way of answering all that I have said in two words, though he himself obliges the world with no other authors. For the Councils will be allowed, on all hands, to be the public voice of the Church; and, therefore, to make speedy despatch of this dispute, and bring it to a short issue, I have chosen to prove my thesis from the proceedings of the general and provincial councils against heretics and schismatics, which are proofs that are liable to no exceptions of this kind, so long as they are the genuine acts of the councils they pretend to be, and are understood by us in the genuine sense and meaning of them. Let these,

Digitized by Google

then, be the *dernier ressort* and final inquiry, as to what concerns ancient history upon this point, between me and this author. And let him remember, that the only question now is, Whether the ancient heretics and schismatics had not their commission vacated by the same episcopal power and authority which at first gave it? If the reader desires to see an answer to what this author urges from St. Jerome, St. Basil, and St. Chrysostom, which are the only authorities that seem to carry any colour of an argument in them, he may find it in the entrance of the foregoing discourse, where I state the controversy with Dr. Brett, and shew how he mistakes the sense of each of them; and particularly, that Basil's opinion of heretics' being divested of their commission, and made laymen, is agreeable to the sense of the whole Catholic Church, and therefore utterly destructive of our author's contrary notion and assertion.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

### OF THE GREEK CHURCH, AND THE CHURCHES OF THE REFORMATION.

SECT. I.—*That the Ancient Greek Church had several Laws before the Eighth Century, determining the Validity of uncommissioned Lay-Baptism.*

I HAVE now but one thing more to consider with our author, which is the reflections he makes upon the account which I gave of the modern Greek Church, and the Churches of the Reformation. I began my account of the modern Greek Church, with the canons of Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople, who lived in the beginning of the ninth century: and I thought it was very proper to give an account of the modern practice of the Greek Church from modern writers. But our author takes occasion hence to observe, page 212, "That for the first eight hundred years, that Church had no rule, ecclesiastical law, or custom, whereby to determine the pretended validity of any lay-baptisms whatsoever." I hope by this time our author is a little

Digitized by Google

better informed and satisfied, when he has considered how many ancient general councils, during that term of eight hundred years, by their ecclesiastical laws and rules, determined the validity of heretical baptism; and how many of the same councils, with many others, determined likewise, that those very heretics were deprived of all sacerdotal power, authority, and commission, and consequently in the state of unauthorized laymen: as I had sufficiently intimated in the first part of my Scholastical History, and have now more substantially proved in this. Therefore his harangue about the great extent of the Greek Church, and how significant a part it was of the Catholic Church, is only against himself; though he designed it as a specious pretext to impose upon his readers. And for the authorities of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom, which are so often produced for the invalidity of lay-baptism, I have shewed before, in stating the controversy with Dr. Brett, that they make nothing to his purpose.

SECT. II. — *The Authority of the Canons of Nicephorus vindicated from our Author's Exceptions.*

He next runs out against Nicephorus, as a zealous promoter of the superstition of image-worship, and says, page 214, "That his authority is of no more value in this case of lay-baptism, than it is in the other, of the use of images in Divine worship." I did not desire it to be of any greater value: I produced it only to determine a question of fact, not of right, whether lay-baptism, in any case, was then allowed in the Greek Church? The question was not, whether it was lawful or unlawful in itself, but whether it was then the practice of the Greek Church? And his testimony is sufficient to decide this to be their practice, though their practice might chance to be against a Divine law, which is another question. So if the question had been about image-worship, as to fact only, whether it was then set up in the Greek Church, the testimony of Nicephorus, or the second Council of Nice, had been good in this case to have proved the fact, though not sufficient to have justified the lawfulness of the practice. But our author cunningly

Digitized by Google

confounds these questions of fact and right together, and labours artificially to work his reader into an ill opinion of Nicephorus, only to ruin his credit as a historian.

But if this will not succeed, he would have his reader believe these canons were only the private dictates of Nicephorus, not made in any authentic council at all, page 215, especially not in the council of two hundred and seventy bishops, anno 814. I am not much concerned what council they were made in; though I think it as likely to be in the council of two hundred and seventy bishops as any other. But this is not the question. Were they not canons of the Greek patriarch? and were the canons of the patriarch of no force in the Greek Church? If not, how came Harmenopulus to make use of them as canon-law, in a Collection of Rules to direct men in their practice? This one reason is of more weight with me than all our author's little criticisms to the contrary; who, if Nicephorus and his canons had been for his turn, could have said as many pretty things in their favour, as now he does to their prejudice, only to bias his reader against them. He could have said, that patriarchs did not use to make canons but in synod; or if otherwise, yet their power was so ample and extensive, that their canons were of force through all the Churches under their jurisdiction. But now, these canons are not the declared authentic sense of the Greek Church; and that for another reason, page 220: because some Greek writers wrote boldly against the lawfulness of lay-baptism in any case whatsoever; which, it is reasonable to believe, they would have been more tender of opposing, if it had been the general sense and practice of the Greek Church. As if our author, or I, or our readers, knew none at this day, who write boldly against the approved lawful sense and practice of the Church of England, without any tenderness for the standing rules and orders of the Church. It is low waters with a man, and his invention is almost exhausted, when he is forced to make use of such pretty arguments as these.

But he returns upon us again with St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, and the whole Greek Church, for 800 years, page 221.

Digitized by Google

In answer to which, I have shewed him before, that St. Basil's canons, which he says were part of the canon-law of the Greek Church, pronounce heretics to be no more than laymen: and the Greek Church, for 800 years, did the same; and yet received the baptisms of those laymen without rebaptization. Which is another sort of demonstration of the sense and practice of the Greek Church, than any our author pretends to give us.

At last he comes to the poor shift to tell his readers, page 221, "That Nicephorus was wrought upon by the emissaries of the Church of Rome, to introduce this novelty into the Greek Church; and that gave just occasion to others of the Greek Church, who were jealous for the truths of Christianity, to give that Church timely warning of dangerous Romish novelties creeping in among them; of which number Georgius Hamartolus, Glycas, and Theodorus Scutariota, appear to have been, in vigorously opposing the pretended lawfulness of lay-baptism, which was first started only in the Latin Church." This pretence of being wrought upon by Romish emissaries serves our author at all turns, when he has nothing else to say to lessen the credit, or elude the testimony, of any writer; and we shall have more of it by and by, against the modern Greeks. Here I observe only, how he gives characters of men, just as they seem to favour or not favour his own opinions. The authority of Nicephorus was not worth a straw, because he was a zealous defender of image-worship; but Hamartolus and Glycas, though they were as zealous defenders of image-worship as Nicephorus, are honest men, jealous for the truths of Christianity, only because they vigorously opposed the pretended lawfulness of lay-baptism. When men can be thus partial in giving characters of men, I think it matters not much what they say for or against them: and, therefore, the canons of Nicephorus will stand good still, as rules for the Greek Church, notwithstanding all these little pleas of our author against them.

Digitized by Google

SECT. III.—*Our Author's disingenuous Way of answering the modern Greek Writers.*

In the year 1166, I observed there was a Council at Constantinople, which denied the validity of baptism given by pretended or false priests, who counterfeited orders, pretending to be priests when they were not so. Our author upon this says, "I can produce no councils for 1200 years, that would have determined otherwise than this Council did in this matter;" when yet I have shewed him, that most of the ancient Councils said, Heretics were no priests, but false priests, pretending to be priests when they were not so; and yet they did not order such persons as were baptized by them, to be rebaptized, as this Council did. I said further concerning the decree of this Council, that it had not said any thing particularly about the invalidity of laymen's baptism in extraordinary cases of absolute necessity; and therefore it might consist with the canons of Nicephorus, which only respected such cases. To this our author replies, "That the power of baptizing was committed only to those who were vested with a priestly power, and laics have no such power or authority given them" (page 230). But now our author forgets what he had so often asserted before, "That upon supposition a layman could have the bishop's authority and commission to baptize in an extraordinary case of necessity, he would, in that act, and for that time, so far be a priest, and invested with sacerdotal power, and not be in that act a mere uncommissioned layman." And why might not this Greek Council be of our author's mind, and think laymen that were commissioned to baptize in a particular case, to be priests in that act, and not mere laymen? And if so, there is no contradiction between the canons of Nicephorus and this Council: for they both allow the baptisms of men invested with sacerdotal powers.

But however it was, I shewed that the Greeks practised according to the rules given in the canons of Nicephorus, to this day; and this I proved from undoubted evidences of historians and others, who give an account of their practice. To smother which glaring evidence, our author first betakes

Digitized by Google

himself to his usual art of lessening the authority of the witnesses, by saying, page 236, "They were no more than particular men, and their authority of no importance." As if a number of credible historians agreeing together, were not sufficient authority to shew us what was the practice of any Church, when the question was only about a matter of fact, and not right; and no contrary evidence is so much as pretended to confront or contradict them. "But it is very notorious," our author says, secondly, "that in these latter ages the Greeks are, by the craft and subtilty of the Romish emissaries, divided into two parties." Why did he not then produce the testimony of some of that party, who were against "the Popish doctrine," as he calls it, of allowing laymen to baptize in case of necessity? Or, why did he not prove particularly of the authors I produced, that they were influenced or bribed by the Jesuits to deliver false history in favour of the Romish pretensions? Were they divided into two parties upon this point, and yet all wrote unanimously on one side only? Or, how does he prove that those that wrote, were all in the Romish interest? He entertains his readers, by way of blind, with a long story about the Jesuits usage of Cyrillus Lucaris; which is nothing to the purpose; for this author is not concerned in the dispute, one way or other. He should have shewed that the testimony of Jeremy, the patriarch, was gained only by the art of some Romish emissaries. Instead of this he tells us, "The patriarch was displeased with the Lutherans, for believing invocation of saints to be vain and frivolous, and for despising that adoration which was paid to their images and relics," page 238. And what then? Is it likely, that he who was displeased at the Lutherans, would have represented the practice of the Greek Church, as agreeing with the Lutherans, if it was really otherwise? Nothing can be more improbable than this: and therefore I cannot but imagine our author was in a sort of maze and confusion when he wrote it, since nothing could have been said more directly against his purpose. But he adds, "Mr. Bingham might with as good a grace have produced that patriarch's testimony for these Popish corruptions, invocation of saints, and adoration of images

Digitized by Google

and relics, as for the other." And where had been the harm of that, I pray, if any one had made a question, Whether invocation of saints, and the worship of images, had been the practice of the Greek Church? Could we have had a better evidence for matter of fact in such a case, than the testimony of one of their own patriarchs? Does not our author himself quote a Greek council, and some others before that, for the invalidity of lay-baptism? And why might he not with as good a grace have produced the same authors for the worship of saints and images? No doubt he might, if the question had been only, whether saints and images had then been worshipped in the Greek Church. Their testimony in this case, to determine a matter of fact, had been as good and certain as any other. Why, then, does he quarrel with me for doing that which any one may do, and which he himself has done, without any offence or imputation? I know not, in truth, how he should determine matters of fact, unless from such authors as have particularly wrote about them.

After he has lashed the patriarch, he turns off all the other instances I gave, by saying (page 238), "That they are of so modern a date, that we have reason to believe they are no better than the mere effects of some Greeks being too much infected with the superstitions of the Church of Rome." If these modern Greeks had been of his side, then they had not been too modern for his purpose: but if they were only some Greeks, infected with the Romish superstitions, why did he not produce others not infected with them, to tell us what was the practice of the non-infected Greek Church in the point of lay-baptism? As it happens, our author is very unlucky in his observations on the character of these modern Greeks. For the chief of those writers, which I have quoted, were so far from being Latinized Greeks, that they were professed opposers of the Romish usurpations. Gabriel Severus, archbishop of Philadelphia, is often railed at by Leo Allatius for writing in defence of the Greeks against the Latins, and particularly against the Pope's supremacy, which is the grand usurpation and corruption of the Romish Church. It was a little unfortunate,

Digitized by Google

therefore, in our author, so carelessly, and without considering, to rank that archbishop among those Greeks that were favourers of the Romish Church, when he was so great a stickler against it. He is no happier in applying his character to Metrophanes Critopulus; for this writer was out of the reach of Romish emissaries and Jesuits: he was a student in Oxford, sent into England by Cyrillus Lucaris, and by him recommended to the protection and patronage of Archbishop Abbot, who will not be suspected to have instilled into him any of the Romish corruptions. How, then, could our author, with any modesty, say, the rest of the instances I had given, were out of Latinized Greeks, when it is so plain they were most directly contrary? And why would he not vouchsafe his readers one modern Greek writer, Latinized or unlatinized, that gave a different account from what I did, of the present practice of the Greek Church? That had been the fair way of answering, by confronting and disproving my authorities by better and more credible allegations. But he knew this was not to be attempted; and yet resolving to outface the sun at noonday, he betakes himself to another method to invalidate the evidence, by falling foul upon the character and reputation of the persons, which yet proves as unfortunate as it was disingenuous: for the persons he assaults, were men of a quite different party and character to what he represents and labours to fasten on them; being no Latinized Greeks, but stiff opposers of the Romish Church in all the ancient points controverted between them.

Commend me now rather to the honest ingenuity of Dr. Brett, who, being sensible there was no withstanding so many undeniable evidences and unquestionable allegations, chose rather to confess he had nothing to oppose or say against them, for want of books to make a just inquiry. But this author would not so give up the cause: he pretends there was a party among the Greeks, the true unlatinized Greeks, that would depose and vouch for him: but when he comes to produce his authorities and tell the evidence, there is not one appears in his behalf; even the unlatinized Greeks, as well as the rest, are all against him. And,



Digitized by Google

therefore, with what success this bold undertaker has adventured to advance one step further than Dr. Brett, and walk where he thought it not safe to tread, I now leave to the judgment of every sensible and ingenuous reader.

SECT. IV.—*That the Reason of the Greeks' Practice was not their Opinion of the Absolute Necessity of Baptism for dying Infants.*

I have but one remark more to make upon our author in relation to the modern Greek Church. He says, page 239, "That the reason of this practice of some of the Greeks is the uncharitable and cruel opinion which some of the Romanists hold of infants dying without baptism, and which those Greeks have learned from them." Now our author knows very well, that this opinion about infants was the doctrine of St. Austin and other Latin Fathers, long before the Roman Popish writers were in being: for he himself charges St. Austin with it, and reckons it the reason also why he allowed laymen to baptize in case of necessity. Why, then, might not the Greeks have it from St. Austin, as well as from the friars and Jesuits of the Romish Church? But the absolute necessity of baptism for dying infants was not the reason of allowing laymen to baptize; for laymen were allowed to baptize adult persons, as well as infants, in cases of necessity. And yet St. Austin had not that opinion of the absolute necessity of baptism for adult persons, that he is commonly supposed to have of it for infants; because he particularly excepts two sorts of adult persons, as the rest of the Catholic writers commonly do, from the severity of the sentence, viz.: first, such catechumens as died martyrs, baptized in their own blood; and, secondly, such of them as made profession of a true faith and a sincere repentance, and died without baptism; not in any contempt or neglect of it, but by some extreme necessity, which debarred them from it, when they most earnestly desired it. They who represent St. Austin's opinion otherwise, I will make bold to say, are ignorant of his doctrine, which ought not to be spoken of without this necessary distinction between infants and adult persons. Now, then, to found the opinion St.

Digitized by Google

Austin had of the lawfulness of laymen's baptizing adult persons in cases of necessity, upon the doctrine of the absolute necessity of baptism for infants, is doing wrong to St. Austin; because it is certain this reason will not extend to adult persons, unless St. Austin had entertained the same notion of them as he did of others. And that he did not, I shall have occasion to shew very plainly in the next volume of my *Origines*,[a] which is now preparing for the press. If, then, St. Austin did not found the lawfulness of laymen's baptizing in cases of necessity upon the opinion of the absolute necessity of baptism for infants, but upon some more general reason, that equally extends to adult persons also; it is more than probable the Greeks did so too: as I shall be inclined to think, till I see better reasons than our author has offered to the contrary.

But I will presume to ask our author two questions further. First, how he is assured that this uncharitable and cruel opinion, about infants dying without baptism, was embraced by the Greeks at all? And, secondly, why he ascribes it only to some of them, and not to the rest? If he says, They must needs be of this opinion, because they allowed laymen to baptize in cases of necessity; I answer, That that is no reason at all: for many men allow laymen to baptize in such cases, who yet were never tinctured with that opinion: as the Lutherans, who hold that infants, dying unbaptized, may be saved, as well as adult persons: and some of the Romanists, by his own confession; for he makes this cruel opinion not to be the doctrine of all the Romanists, but only of some of them. If, then, some of the Romanists, and all the Lutherans, could allow laymen to baptize, in cases of necessity, without making any such cruel doctrine, about infants dying unbaptized, to be the reason and foundation of it; why might not the Greeks do so too? Since it does not necessarily follow, that the reason of allowing laymen to baptize, is any such cruel opinion of infants dying without baptism. But admit some to be of this opinion; how does it appear, that it is only the opinion

[a] The fourth volume in this edition, the fifth in the original.

Digitized by Google

of some of the Greeks, and not of all? Our author produces the testimony of neither side, to make good his assertion. And if he says, it must needs be so, because it was only some of the Greeks that allowed laymen to baptize in cases of necessity, but not all of them, I have already shewed that to be false: for the unlatinized Greeks allowed this liberty to laymen, as well as the Latinized: and, therefore, if the reason of this allowance was only the cruel and uncharitable opinion of infants dying unbaptized, it must either be ascribed to them all or none. But whether they held this opinion or not, which I dispute not with our author, it is plain this was not the necessary reason of allowing laymen to baptize, since that might be done without holding any such cruel and uncharitable opinion. So little strength or solidity is there in any part of our author's account of the Greek Churches, either in point of history, or in point of reason, after thirty pages spent upon it.

### SECT. V.—*Of the Moscovite, or Russian Churches.*

Next for the Moscovite Churches, I gave an instance of their rule from one of the Canons of John, their metropolitan, which orders, that children, in case of necessity, should be baptized without a priest. Now, instead of confronting this, by producing some contrary canons, he only says (page 241), "This was one single man's authority; no synod or council mentioned wherein this canon was made." And that it was not the general opinion of those Churches, he concludes from the contrary practice of the people. But, till he produces some contrary canon, of equal weight and force with this of their metropolitan and patriarch, his saying so will not pass for a sufficient answer. He supposes this metropolitan made an innovation in the Church; and the people, tenacious of their ancient custom, would not submit to his novel canon, or his injunction. But this is all precarious, and a mere supposition without proof; therefore, it lies upon him to shew that the Moscovites, who had their religion from the modern Greeks, had originally contrary rules of discipline settled in their Churches; and then it will look a little more probable that this John, whom

Digitized by Google

they called their prophet, was an innovator; though still it will be something harsh and uncouth to join such disagreeable epithets together, and give one and the same man the titles both of prophet and innovator. I should rather think the Churches, at first, very readily complied with the directions of their prophet; but, afterwards, his rules came to be neglected by the degeneracy and corruptions of the people. Our author thinks otherwise: but, till he produces some authentic canon to confront this, I cannot come into his opinion.

### Sect. VI.—*No further Dispute about the Lutheran Churches.*

Next for the Lutheran Churches, he owns the account I gave of them, to be true: but he says (p. 247), "They have no Catholic principle whereon to found their practice; and that their reasons are very weak, insignificant, and false." Which is not now the question, for we are only considering matters historically; and, so long as he owns what I delivered before, to be true in fact, we will enter into no further dispute about them.

### Sect. VII.—*Nor about Zuinglius and the Helvetic Churches.*

For the same reason, we need not stand about the opinion of Zuinglius or the Helvetic Churches: for he acknowledges the account to be true: only he cries out, "Popery! Popery!"—because no prohibition was laid upon men in cases of necessity, nor any order made for rebaptizing those who were irregularly baptized by others. But if this be Popery, it was the Popery of the Primitive Church, which, neither by general or provincial council, laid any prohibition upon men in cases of necessity, nor made any order for rebaptizing those that were irregularly baptized by others: but, on the contrary, made many orders, both in general and provincial councils, against rebaptizing those that were baptized by heretics and schismatics, though those heretics and schismatics were determined to be no authorized priests, but uncommissioned laymen.

Digitized by Google

SECT. VIII.—*That the Calvinists do, in some Cases, own the Validity of Lay-Baptism.*

In stating the opinion of Calvin, our author finds several faults with my account. First, he says, I wrong translate Calvin's words, "Adeoque, ab ipso fere Ecclesiæ exordio, usu receptum fuit, ut in periculo mortis laici baptizarent, si minister in tempore non adesset:" this only implies a received custom, not a general prevailing custom, he says, that laymen should baptize in danger of death, and that not always, but only almost from the beginning of the Church. But what difference there is between a received custom, and generally prevailing custom, I think we had best leave to the critics to determine. If Calvin had expressed his mind never so clearly, it would have weighed little with our author: for he thinks Calvin was deceived, in allowing the custom to be so early received as he fancied, that is, from near the beginning of the Church.

But, secondly, he is very confident I am mistaken in saying, that Calvin does not peremptorily pronounce such baptisms absolutely null and void, but the contrary: the proof I gave of this, was from the words of Calvin, cited by Archbishop Whitgift, to the same purpose, against Cartwright, viz.: "It is sufficient for us to know the hand and seal of the Lord in his sacraments, by whomsoever they be delivered." In answer to this, our author says (p. 251), "That if the word, 'whomsoever,' as Archbishop Whitgift has it, must be taken in its full extent and meaning, then Calvin will be made to esteem as good and valid all the pretended baptisms of laymen and women, Jews, Turks, infidels, and pagans, which is plainly a novelty of corrupt Popery. And Calvin will be made to speak inconsistently with himself, and to contradict his own principle, which was, that lay-baptism was not lawful in any case whatsoever." Our author here again confounds unauthorized and invalid baptism together, and hence concludes, that because Calvin thought all lay-baptism to be unlawful, therefore he must needs think it absolutely invalid, and, of necessity, to be repeated. Whereas he was not of that

Digitized by Google

opinion, but thought, if it had been the hand and seal of the Lord, that is, the outward form of baptism duly administered, it was not necessary to repeat it, especially in a confused and disorderly state of the Church, where many things were to be tolerated, which were not proper to be endured in a well-regulated and exactly disciplined Church. He did not think the lawfulness of the administrator to be absolutely an essential part of baptism, but only a necessary circumstance, which ought to be observed in all well-disciplined Churches: which yet might be dispensed with in a dissipated state of the Church; and in such cases, though administered by laymen, he thought there was no necessity of repeating it by rebaptization. Our author has already been shewed this by another hand[b] out of Calvin's Epistles,[c] part of which I shall here again transcribe. "Adulterinum baptismum censemus, qui administratus est a privato homine. Ac in ecclesia, recte composita, tolerabilis non esset hæc temeritas. Sed quia id apud vos inter principia contigit, ante restitutum Ecclesiæ ordinem, et rebus adhuc confusis; non tantum errori danda est venia, sed ferendus est qualiscunque baptismus: modo ne in exemplum trahatur, quod semel perperam gestum est. Nam in Ecclesiæ dissipatione multa Deus condonat, quæ nullo modo admittere fas esset in Ecclesiam bene ordinatam. Olim cum vitiata esset religio, haud dubie multis vitiis et corruptelis implicita circumcisio fuit; quam tamen iteratam fuisse non legimus, quum revocaretur populus ad purum cultum. Ergo anxie disquirere necesse non est, ac ne expedit quidem, in omnes circumstantias, quæ innumeros scrupulos gignerent. Proinde quod ignovit Deus sub Papatu, nos quoque sepeliamus. Nunc ubi de vero baptismi usu admonita fuerit Ecclesia, quod pugnaret cum Christi institutione, pro nihilo ducendum esset; ac de integro baptizandus, qui pollutus fuerit profana aspersione:"—'We judge that baptism to be adulterated or vitiated, which is administered by a private man; and this temerity, in a well-ordered Church, ought not to be tolerated.

[b] Letter to the Author of Lay-Baptism Invalid; by a Country Clergyman. (Lond. 1713, p. 33.)

[c] (P. 209, edit. Amstelod. 1667,) (Genevæ, 1575, p. 334.)

Digitized by Google

But because this happened among you in the beginning of the Reformation, before the order of the Church was well restored, and while things were in confusion, this error is not only to be pardoned, but any baptism to be admitted, provided the irregularity of what was once done, be not drawn into precedent or example for the future. For, in the dissipation of the Church, God pardons many things that are not to be admitted of in a well-ordered Church. Heretofore, when religion was corrupted, no doubt many faults and corruptions had crept into circumcision: yet we do not read that it was repeated, when the people were called back to the purity of religion. It is, therefore, neither necessary nor expedient to be too anxious in our inquiries into all circumstances, which may raise innumerable scruples. And, therefore, what God pardoned under the Papacy, let us also bury. Only now that the Church is instructed in the true use of baptism, what is repugnant to Christ's institution, is to be accounted as nothing; and he is to be baptized again, who has been polluted by a profane washing.'

Here it is plain Calvin does not make the public minister so absolutely necessary and essential to baptism, as that all baptisms, ministered by private men in all cases, and especially in a grand dissipation of the Church, are of necessity to be repeated. For he advises against the repetition of such baptisms, as, in the infancy of the Reformation, were given by Popish laymen. But, in a well-settled Church, his opinion was, that by the rules and discipline of such a Church, such baptisms should be ordered to be repeated.

And this, I shewed, also, was the opinion of Dr. Alting, an eminent leader and professor of the Palatine Churches, that baptisms, given by laymen in some exigencies, as that of a dissipation of the Church, were not of necessity to be repeated. But our author replies (page 255), "What signifies the saying of one man, when, according to Mr. Bingham, the Churches of the Palatinate commonly follow the contrary doctrine? And the doctor talks inconsistently with himself too, whilst he acknowledges the same baptism to be illegitimate and unlawful." Our author uses here a great deal of his usual artifice and sleight-of-hand in this

Digitized by Google

answer. For he has an excellent talent at misrepresentation. First, he would persuade his readers that I say, the Palatine Churches commonly follow the contrary doctrine to that which was delivered by Alting; when yet I say nothing of the Palatine Churches, but what makes them plainly agree together. But, secondly, Alting was but one man, and a doctor of no moment in this affair. Yet our author did not think fit to oblige his reader with a doctor of as little moment to confront him, or his opinion, about the validity of lay-baptism in time of persecution, or dissipation of the Church. In which opinion he was not so singular as our author imagines: for, as we see, he followed Calvin in the resolution of this point, and in manner transcribed his arguments taken from circumcision, and baptisms administered by laymen, under the Papacy, which they both call baptisms in a dissipation of the Church. And this makes it probable to me, that this was then the current doctrine both of the Genevans and Palatine Churches. But he says, thirdly, that Alting contradicts himself, in affirming such baptisms to be valid and not necessary to be repeated, whilst yet he acknowledges them to be unlawful and illegitimate, and therefore false and invalid. But, by our author's leave, this contradiction is none of Alting's, but only fathered on him by our author's own inference, whose principles lead him to conclude all unauthorized and unlawful baptisms to be invalid; which is not asserted either by Alting or Calvin, as we have seen in the several testimonies alleged from them: so that thus far, if these men spake the sense of the Genevans and Palatines, they are both contrary to our author.

But, after all, the determination of the question about the baptism of unauthorized laymen, depends not upon the sense or practice of the reformed Churches, but upon the sense and practice of the Primitive Church, to which this author and I appeal: and when the reader fairly considers the evidences produced on both sides, for and against the authority and commission of heretics and schismatics baptizing, whilst they were in their heresy and schism, he will be best able to judge for himself where the truth lies;

Digitized by Google

whether the ancient heretics and schismatics, whose baptisms were received, were true priests, in actual commission never vacated by the Church, as this author asserts; or whether, as I have maintained in the foregoing discourse, they were really and truly deprived of their commission by the authority and discipline of the Church, and left in the state of unauthorized and uncommissioned laymen. The deciding this question decides the whole dispute; and, therefore, this is the only material thing to be examined between me and this author. I have already produced the evidences for my assertion, and leave him and the world to judge of the force of them, having no further concern in the present dispute, but to clear the truth of ancient history, and shew what was the discipline and practice of the Primitive Church; which I suppose, in this question, will have its weight with all sober and unprejudiced readers.

Digitized by Google

# TWO SERMONS,

AND

# TWO LETTERS

TO THE

# LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER,

CONCERNING

# THE NATURE AND NECESSITY OF THE SEVERAL SORTS OF ABSOLUTION.

SHEWING HOW FAR THAT NECESSITY EXTENDS, AND WHERE IT CEASES.

---

*** These two Sermons were subjoined, in the original edition, by way of Appendix to the Nineteenth Book of the Antiquities.—See Vol. VI. of this edition, page 580.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

# SERMON I.

JOHN, XX. 23.

*Whosesoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever Sins ye retain, they are retained.*

THOUGH the doctrine of ministerial absolution, or remission of sins, be a doctrine of great use in Christianity, as a matter wherein our practice is much concerned; yet I know not by what hard fate it has happened, that there are few doctrines which have been more abused or less understood. The extravagancies of some on the one hand, who would have it almost to do every thing in Christianity, have made others think it could do nothing: as violent disputes usually beget great oppositions, and great oppositions commonly end in different extremes. It will not be amiss, therefore, to set this useful and necessary doctrine in its proper light, by discoursing of it in a practical way without any dispute, beginning with its original or first institution.

When our Saviour was about to leave the world he gave commission to his disciples to act in his name, as his ministers and vicegerents, in all things relating to the kingdom of God. This kingdom of God was founded chiefly upon the promise and prospect of pardon or remission of sins: and this pardon was to be dispensed, and ascertained to men by the intervention of those whom he had appointed and commissioned for this very purpose. For this was part of their commission, to remit or to retain sins, as they should judge proper, acting by the rules which he gave them: with a promise that what they did regularly

Digitized by Google

in his Church on earth, should be ratified and confirmed by himself in heaven.

In general, therefore, it is evident beyond dispute, that Christ left a power in the hands of his ministers to retain or to forgive men's sins. But yet to have a more particular account and right apprehension of this, three inquiries will be necessary to be made further.

I. Into the nature of this power, as it belongs to man: for, notwithstanding the commission and authority granted to man, there is still a vast difference to be made between the power of forgiving sins, as exercised by God, and as exercised by man.

II. We must inquire into the several acts or ways, in which the ministers of Christ are commissioned and authorized to exemplify this power.

III. How far all men are bound to submit to the lawful exercise of it.

From the resolution of which points we shall be able to reduce this consideration to practice, and easily discern what are the proper uses to be made of this doctrine of absolution, both as it relates to the ministers of Christ and his people.

I. I begin with the first inquiry into the nature of this power, as it belongs to man. Where I observe, that notwithstanding the commission granted to man, there is still a vast difference to be made between the power of forgiving sins, as exercised by God, and as exercised by man. For the power of God is absolute and sovereign in pardoning sins; his judgment unerring and infallible about the subjects who are capable of pardon; and, consequently, his sentence always exact, and irreversible by any other power whatsoever. Whereas the power of man to forgive sins is not absolute, but only ministerial: his commission and authority is not only derivative, but tied up and bounded by certain rules, which are to be the measures of his proceedings in this grand affair with his fellow-creatures. Consequently his judgment is neither infallible, nor his sentence irreversible, but only so far as he observes the rules prescribed by his sovereign Lord, who still reserves to himself the privilege of

Digitized by Google

reviewing the determinations of the vicegerents and judges upon earth, and of judging over again their sentence by his final and unerring judgment. If the ministers of Christ, indeed, observe exactly the rules which he has prescribed, in judging sinners and pardoning sin; if they neither, through haste or partiality, or ignorance and error, condemn the guiltless, or absolve the guilty; then their sentence, whether it be of remitting or retaining sins, will be confirmed and ratified in heaven: because they act according to the tenour of their commission, and only as faithful stewards conforming to the measures and rules which their sovereign Lord has appointed them. But if they chance to deviate from those rules, either by ignorance of men's case, or the sly pretences of hypocritical sinners;[a] or by any neglect, or weakness, or assuming tyranny, or fond indulgence, or any other passion incident to human nature; in all such cases Christ, the supreme Lord, will judge things over again, and reverse their sentence, whether it be too rigorous or too indulgent: because they exceed their commission, and judge by other rules than what he has appointed them. This is that noted difference between the power of God and man in forgiving sins: the one does it by an absolute and independent authority; the other, only by a subordinate and restrained commission, which is rather a declaration of God's will, than any sovereign power invested in him. For no man can say to his brother, with the same authority and infallible assurance, as Christ did to the thief upon the cross, "To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise." This is the prerogative of God alone, to pardon sins with an absolute and uncontrollable power. And in this sense it is properly said

[a] Cyprian, to this purpose, says: Neque enim præjudicamus Domino judicaturo, quo minus si pœnitentiam plenam et justam peccatoris invenerit, tunc ratum faciat quod a nobis fuerit hic statutum. Si vero nos aliquis pœnitentiæ simulatione deluserit; Deus qui non deridetur, et qui cor hominis intuetur, de his quæ nos minus perspeximus, judicet, et servorum sententiam emendet. (Cyprian. Epist. lii. al. lv. ad Antonian.) (Oxon. 1682, p. 108.) ——In like manner, Pacian. Ep. i. (Bibl. Patr. tom. iii. p. 53,) (tom. iv. p. 307, Lugd. 1677.) Reddet quidem ille rationem, si quid perperam fecerit, vel si corrupte et impie judicarit. Nec præjudicatur Deo, quo minus mali ædificatoris opera rescindat: interea si pia illa administratio est, adjutor Dei operum perseverat.

Digitized by Google

in Scripture, that "none can forgive sins but God." And upon this foundation Athanasius, and the generality of the ancient writers,[b] always argued for the Divinity of our Saviour against Arius, from this topic, that he took upon him to forgive sins with an absolute authority, which was the peculiar privilege of God alone.

Yet this does not hinder but that man may have a ministerial part in the forgiveness of sins, in such acts as are, by commission, intrusted with him: and what those acts of his ministry are, I come now, in the next place, to consider by proceeding in order to the second inquiry, which was—

II. What those special acts or ways are, in which the ministers of Christ are commissioned or authorized to exemplify this their power of retaining or remitting sins?

Now these, upon an exact inquiry, appear to be these four acts of the ministry, whereby the benefit of absolution is ordinarily dispensed unto men.

1. The power of administering the two sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper to all such as are qualified to receive them. Which is, therefore, called 'sacramental absolution.'

2. The power of declaring or publishing the terms or conditions, upon which the Gospel promises pardon and remission of sins, which is called the 'declaratory absolution of the word and doctrine.'

3. The power of interceding with God for pardon of sins through the merits of Christ; which is 'the absolution of prayer.'

4. The power of executing church-discipline and censures upon delinquents; which consists in excluding flagitious and scandalous sinners from the communion of the Church, and receiving penitents again into her communion, when they have given just evidences of a sincere repentance. In these four acts, regularly exercised, consists the ministerial power of retaining or remitting sins, so far as the delegated authority of man can be concerned in it.

1. In the power of administering the two sacraments of

[b] See this fully proved, Origin. Eccles. Book xix. chap. i. sect. i.

Digitized by Google

baptism and the Lord's supper to all such as were qualified to receive them. Baptism is the grand absolution[c] of the Christian Church: for by it all men, who are admitted as living members of Christ's mystical body—the Church, receive certain and universal remission of sins. Whence it had anciently the names[d] of 'indulgence,' and 'salvation,' and 'remission of sins,' because these were the undoubted effects to all worthy receivers of it. Therefore, so far as the ministers of Christ are authorized to admit proselytes and converts into the Church by the sacrament of baptism, so far they are empowered to grant remission of sins; because they administer that, whose proper effect is the remission of sins, as it is the seal of God's covenant, and means of conveying all the spiritual blessings of Christ's death and passion to all those who come, in the sincerity of their hearts, with due qualifications, to receive it.

Now it is certain the ministers of Christ are invested with a power, not only to administer this sacrament unto men, but also to judge, by certain rules of probation, who are proper and capable subjects of it; and, according as they find them qualified or unqualified, by bringing them to the test of those rules, correspondently either to receive them, or reject them from the privilege of baptism. Which is, in effect, to grant them, or not grant them, remission of sins, because it is to grant them, or not grant them, that ordinary means, which is made by Christ the seal of remission of sins. The ancients commonly found this power of remitting or retaining sins in baptism upon these very words of the text, and those other words of our Saviour to Peter, "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." St. Cyril of Alexandria, expounding the words of the text, says,[e] "Spiritual men remit or retain sins two

[c] See the sense of the ancients upon this point, Orig. Eccles. vol. vi. p. 530, book xix. chap. i. sect. ii.

[d] Ibid.

[e] Cyril. lib. xii. in Joan. xx. 23, p. 1101. Ἀφιᾶσι ἁμαρτίας, ἢ τοι πατέχουσιν οἱ πνευματοφόροι κατὰ δύο τρόπους, κατά γε διάνοιαν ἰμήν ἢ γὰρ καλοῦσιν ἐπὶ τὸ βάπτισμα τοὺς, οἷς ἂν ἤδη καὶ τούτου τυχεῖν ὠφέλιτο διὰ τὴν τοῦ βίου σεμνότητα, καὶ τὸ δεδοκιμασμένον εἰς πίστιν, ἢ διακωλύουσί τινας, καὶ τῆς θείας χάριτος



Digitized by Google

ways: 1. When they call those to baptism who are worthy of it, upon the account of a good life and approved faith; or forbid and repel those from the Divine gift, who are unworthy of it. 2. When they punish and correct the children of the Church for offending, and pardon them again upon their repentance." St. Cyprian and St. Ambrose, having to deal with the Novatians, who denied the Church all manner of power to pardon sins after baptism, argue with them upon this common principle acknowledged on both sides, that Christ gave his ministers power to remit sins by baptism. For the Novatians did not deny this; therefore St. Ambrose reduces them to an absurdity, with great acuteness, putting this question to them,[f] "Why do ye baptize, if sins cannot be remitted by the ministry of man? What is the difference, whether priests assume this power, as given to them in the exercise of penance, or in the administration of baptism?" Plainly implying, that the administration of baptism was one way of remitting sins. And it may be said with truth, that the ancients were generally in these sentiments,[g] and perhaps to a man, concurring in this opinion, that the ministers of Christ are instrumental in remitting of sins by the administration of baptism.

It is true, indeed, this power of giving or refusing baptism to men, is not a mere arbitrary, absolute, or despotic power, authorizing the ministers of Christ to give or refuse it at their own mere pleasure; but, as we said, it is a ministerial power, tying them to certain rules, whereby they are to judge, whether men be duly qualified for baptism or not; and, accordingly, obliging them to admit or reject them. They are to examine, whether men sincerely perform the ordinary conditions required of all men that come to Christ's

ἰξίεργουσιν ἴσι οὔπω τίνος γεγονότας ἀξίους· ἢ καὶ καθ' ἕτερον τρόπον ἀφιᾶσί τι καὶ κρατοῦσιν ἁμαρτίας, ἰπιτιμῶντις μὲν ἁμαρτάνουσι τοῖς τῆς ἐκκλησίας τέκνοις, μετανοοῦσι δὲ συγγινώσκουσις.

[f] Ambros. de Pœnit. lib. i. c. vii. Cur baptizatis, si per hominem peccata dimitti non licet? In baptismo utique remissio peccatorum omnium est. Quid interest, utrum per pœnitentiam, an per lavacrum, hoc jus sibi datum sacerdotes vindicent?

[g] See this proved, Orig. Eccles. Book xix. chap. i. sect. ii.

Digitized by Google

holy baptism; that is, whether they make profession of believing such necessary articles of the Christian faith, as the Church has commonly summed up in her Creed; and whether they promise to renounce Satan and all his works; and whether they actually forsake his service, by a manifest and plain conversion and turning unto God, engaging themselves, by covenant, to live in constant and perpetual obedience to all the laws of Christ. They who take upon them these professions, and actually perform these conditions, have a right to demand baptism; and the ministers of Christ are empowered and obliged to minister it to them; that is, to seal unto them the remission of their sins. But if they contumaciously refuse any one of these conditions; if they either will not make profession of the severa articles of the Christian faith; or not renounce their old master, and promise universal obedience unto Christ; or continue in the open or avowed practice of any notorious vice, and scandalous profession of life; then the ministers of Christ are equally empowered[h] to reject such men from baptism; that is, to retain their sins, by denying them the ordinary means of remission and forgiveness.

Thus far it is plain, even to a demonstration, that the ministers of Christ are invested with a power of retaining or remitting sins, as they are appointed by Christ to be the administrators of baptism, and subordinate judges of the fitness and qualifications of such persons as are to be admitted to it. For they who are intrusted with the ordinary administration of such a mystery, as conveys or seals remission of sins to men, must be allowed to be the proper instruments of binding and loosing, of retaining and remitting men's sins, whilst they are authorized to admit the worthy, and reject the unworthy from the participation of such a mystery.

The case is the very same with respect to their power in administering the other sacrament of the Lord's supper.

[h] The practice of the Primitive Church, in rejecting all such from baptism, who refused any of these necessary conditions, is largely set forth by St. Austin, de Fide et Operibus, cap. xv. xvii. and xviii. &c.: and both out of him and others, in Orig. Eccles. book ii. chap. v. sect. vi.; and chap. vii. sect. vi. and viii.

Digitized by Google

For that, also, is a means of conveying and sealing to men the remission of sins. It only differs from baptism in this: that baptism is the first grant of such a blessing, and the Lord's supper is a further confirmation of continuance and repetition of it. So that as ministers are empowered, by virtue of being stewards of Christ's mysteries, to admit the worthy to a participation of the eucharist, and debar the unworthy, or scandalous and profane livers, from the be efit of such communion; so far they are invested with power of remitting or retaining men's sins, as being proper judges of men's qualifications for the reception or not reception of such a mystery, upon which, in the ordinary method and dispensation of God's grace, remission of sins is made to depend.

And herein consists the first act of the minister's power in remitting or retaining sins, by applying to men the sacraments of the Church, in the use of which remission of sins is granted to all worthy receivers.

2. The second act of this power is the declaratory absolution of the word and doctrine, which consists in publishing the terms and conditions upon which the Gospel promises pardon and remission of sins. This is either general or particular: the general absolution is such as our Church appoints every minister to pronounce after the general confession of sins in her daily service; where it is said, that "God hath given power and commandment to his ministers to declare and pronounce to his people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins;" by virtue of which power they declare, that "God pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent, and unfeignedly believe his holy Gospel." This in effect is done, whenever a minister publishes or preaches the terms of the Gospel to men, declaring in God's name upon what conditions remission of sins may be obtained; and the design of it is to excite and encourage all sinners to repent and turn to God in hopes of mercy, and to give consolation and comfort to all such, as do actually and sincerely turn to Him. For which reason the Church has thought fit to insert this into her public offices, and give it a place in her daily liturgy; which is a peculiar excellency and

Digitized by Google

commendation of her service; the want whereof is lamented in some other Churches. For Calvin declares,[1] he was very desirous to have had such a general declaratory absolution inserted into the Geneva Liturgy, but could not prevail with his associates to introduce it.

But, besides this generally declaratory absolution retained in our service, there is a more particular absolution appointed to be given to single persons in some special cases; that is, when men labour under troubles of mind and disquiet of conscience for any particular sins, which they make confession of to a minister, with proper signs of a genuine repentance. In that case, the minister is authorized, not only to give them ghostly counsel and advice, but also the benefit of absolution; that is, if, upon a just examination of their case, he judges them to be real penitents before God, then he may not only declare to them the general promises of pardon, but assure them in particular, that as far as he can judge of their case by the visible tokens and indications of their repentance, he esteems them absolved before God, and accordingly declares and pronounces to them their absolution. This is no infallible judgment, indeed, because one man may deceive another by specious pretences of repentance, which are not always real: but yet it is as great an assurance, as a prudent, sagacious, and pious minister of Christ can give to his fellow-creature for his satisfaction, without particular inspiration.

And it must needs be of considerable weight and moment towards the satisfaction and comfort of an afflicted or a doubtful and desponding soul, to have the declaration of a skilful physician to rely upon; to have one, who by his office is qualified to be a proper judge in such cases, to pronounce his absolution.

[1] Calvin. Ep. de quibusdam Ecclesiæ Ritibus, p. 206. Confessioni publicæ adjungere insignem aliquam promissionem, quæ peccatores ad spem veniæ et reconciliationis erigat, nemo nostrum est, qui non agnoscat utilissimum esse. Atque ab initio hunc morem inducere volui: sed quum offensionem quidam ex novitate metuerent, nimium facilis fui ad cedendum, ita res omissa est. Nunc vero non esset opportunum, heic quidquam mutare: quia, antequam ad finem confessionis ventum fuerit, magna pars incipit surgere. Quo magis optamus, dum vobis integrum est, populum vestrum ad utrumque adsuefieri.

Digitized by Google

Therefore, our Church, for the comfort of such penitent sinners, has appointed the minister in two of her Offices (the exhortation to the communion, and visitation of the sick) to grant such a particular absolution, saying in one of them, "By the authority of Jesus Christ committed unto me, I absolve thee from all thy offences." Which though it be not an absolute authority, yet it is such a declaration of God's will, as one man can make to another upon the nicest inquiry into his state and maturest consideration. It is like the priest's declaration under the old law, concerning the leper, whether he was clean or unclean. His declaration or judgment concerning such an one is said to be the cleansing or polluting him; the making him clean or unclean; though, strictly speaking, the priest did neither make him leprous, nor not leprous; but only declare, upon a just examination and view, whether he was so or not. In like manner, St. Jerome, and the Master of the Sentences, and many others after them, have observed,[k] that the ministers of the Gospel have that right and office, in remitting or retaining sins, which the legal priests had of old, under the law, in curing of the lepers: they forgive sins or retain them, whilst they shew and declare, that they are forgiven or retained by God. And such a declaration, proceeding from the mouth of those who are constituted ministerial judges of particular men's repentance, is justly construed an evangelical absolution, sufficient to minister satisfaction and comfort to the penitent sinner.

3. The third act of this ministerial power is intercession with God for pardon of sins through the merits of Christ; which is what the Church has always called the absolution of prayer, joined to the absolution of the word and sacraments. This always, either implicitly or expressly accompanies the other acts of absolution,[l] as a chief part of the minister's office, which is to intercede and pray to God for the sins of the people. The sacraments are sometimes administered in a precatory form, as is that of the eucharist

[k] See the Testimonies of St. Jerome and Peter Lombard, related at length, Orig. Eccles. Book xix. chap. i. sect. vi. vol. vi. p. 544.

[l] Ibid. p. 539, chap. i. sect. v.; and p. 550, chap. ii. sect. iv.

Digitized by Google

in our liturgy: "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." And so some tell us,[m] that baptism now in the Greek Church is administered in the like manner and form: *Baptizetur servus Christi in nomine Patris, &c.* 'Let the servant of Christ be baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, by way of prayer.' And though our present form, "I baptize thee," differ a little from this, yet it is always accompanied with prayers, that God would release the party baptized of his sins, and grant him all the benefits of regeneration. So it is observable, that immediately after the general declaratory absolution in our liturgy, the Church appoints the Lord's prayer to be used, as that whereby we obtain a general discharge or remission of sins of daily incursion. And some of our Church's forms of absolution are plain and direct prayers for pardon and forgiveness. As that in the communion-office after the general confession; where the rubric says, "Then shall the priest or the bishop being present, stand up, and turning himself to the people, pronounce this absolution; 'Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who, of his great mercy, hath promised forgiveness of sins to all them, that with hearty repentance and true faith turn unto him; have mercy upon you, pardon and deliver you from all your sins, confirm and strengthen you in all goodness, and bring you to everlasting life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.'" Here the declaratory absolution and the precatory are evidently joined together in the same prayer: for the prayer consists partly of a declaration of God's promises to pardon true penitent sinners; and partly, of an intercession with God, for actual pardon for those particular sinners, for whom the minister then makes his application and address to the Throne of grace. And there are many other such forms of absolution throughout the liturgy of our Church: nay, all the absolutions of the ancient Church,—when penitents, after excommunication and and a long course of discipline, were received into grace and favour again,—were accompanied with imposition of hands and prayer,[n] to denote that the ministerial benediction and

[m] Decretum Eugenii ad calcem Conc. Florent.

[n] See this fully proved, Orig. Eccles. book xix. chap. ii. sect. iv.

Digitized by Google

intercession with God for sinners, was a principal, though not the only act of sacerdotal power in the business of evangelical absolution. And this was conformable to the rule of benediction given by Moses to the priests of the old law (Numb. vi. 27), "They shall put my name upon the children of Israel, and I will bless them." It is God, properly speaking, that blesses and pardons: and yet when the priests intercede with God for these things, they are also said, in their way, to give blessing and absolution. All which fully evinces intercession and prayer to be one sort of ministerial absolution, as it is a means in the hand of man, whereby God is pleased to derive and shower down the blessing of his absolution upon his people.

There is yet a fourth instance of this power of remitting and retaining sins, which is the power of executing church-discipline and censures upon delinquents. This consists in excluding flagitious and scandalous sinners from the communion of the Church, and receiving penitents into communion again upon their submission and repentance. This is properly a judicial act: for as the ministers of Christ are judges of men's qualifications for their first admission into the Church by baptism, so are they judges of their qualifications for their continuance in the same; and as stewards of the mysteries of God, they are obliged to separate the precious from the vile, and distinguish the worthy receivers of those mysteries from the profaners and contemners of them. "Holy things are not to be given unto dogs, neither are pearls to be cast before swine:" and, therefore, when men debase themselves to those infamous and brutish characters, they have no longer a right to the privileges of Christian communion; but are to be lopped off as unsound branches, partly to avoid contagion and infection of the sound members, and partly to make the sinners themselves ashamed, and thereby bring them to reformation and amendment.

It is true, indeed, this power is not arbitrary in the ministers of Christ: they are not to use this severest of punishments for every jealousy and suspicion of evil; nor yet for every light and trivial offence, which may be cured by

Digitized by Google

other remedies; nor for greater or more heinous crimes, without previous admonition, and trial of other methods, which Christ has appointed to be used for the reformation of sinners; nor yet upon whole bodies of men,° where there is danger of rooting up the wheat with the tares, and of doing more harm than good to the Church, by involving the innocent with the guilty, or laying whole Churches under interdict, or occasioning great and dangerous schisms, to the Church's manifest peril and destruction. For the design of this power and discipline is for edification, and not for destruction; to cleanse and purify the Church, but not to shock its very constitution, and raze and overturn its foundations by an indiscreet and intemperate zeal for the preservation of it. And therefore here, if ever, the ministerial power is to be exercised with the greatest wisdom and prudence, as well as charity and concern for the souls of men, and the good of the whole community. Of all which the ministers of Christ are constituted discretionary judges, invested with power to examine both men's faith and morals, and to exclude the scandalous and profane, and to re-admit the truly penitent upon their giving evident tokens of a real conversion, and bringing forth fruits meet for repentance. They are Christ's substitutes and vicegerents in his Church, binding and loosing, opening and shutting, with the keys of the kingdom of heaven: which so long as they use according to the rules prescribed them by Christ, their sentence, though only ministerial, is of great effect in the external communion of the Church at present, and will be found to be of force, as a prejudging forerunner of the sentence of the last day. For under these limitations, and reserving a due prerogative to the infallible sovereignty of Christ, it cannot be doubted, but that whosesoever sins they retain, they are retained; and whosesoever sins they remit, they are remitted unto them.

I should now have proceeded to the third inquiry, How far it is necessary for all men to submit to the ministerial exercise of this power in all the four several branches of it thus explained; and also have reduced this whole consi-

° See the practice of the Primitive Church illustrated in all these cases, Orig. Eccles. vol. vi. p. 363, book xvi. chap. iii. sect. vi. &c.

Digitized by Google

deration to practice: but because the just examination of these things would exceed the limits of the present discourse, I shall only say these two things, by way of general remark, in the close of it.

1. That the necessity of absolution in any kind is the same as the necessity of the thing, by which it is wrought and ministered to us. So that if there be any necessity of receiving the two sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper, there is the same necessity of receiving the sacramental absolution, that is conveyed to us by and in the use of those holy mysteries. If there be any necessity of having the conditions of the Gospel, and God's general promises of pardon, declared to us, and applied to our souls; then there is an equal necessity of a general declaratory absolution, to excite our hopes, and invigorate our faith, and engage us to a true repentance and holy obedience. If there be any necessity for an afflicted soul, that labours under insuperable doubts and troubles of mind, to be relieved of her burden, and to be quietly settled in a state of comfort and satisfaction; then there is a like necessity of a particular declaratory absolution. If there be any necessity of the public prayers of the Church, to implore God's mercy for the remission of sins to public penitents; then there is the same necessity of a precatory absolution. And, finally, if there be any necessity for scandalous sinners, who are cast out of the Church, to be restored to the peace and communion of the Church again, in order to make their peace with God; then there is a necessity of a judicial absolution. So far as any of these offices and ministries are necessary in the Church, so far the several sorts of absolution, that depend upon them, must be concluded to be necessary likewise. And so far a respect is due to them, as the ordinances of God: insomuch as that where they may be ordinarily had, they are not ordinarily to be omitted, much less to be despised or neglected; because that, in other words, is the same thing as contemning the sacraments of Christ, and public prayer, and preaching, and the discipline and censures of the Church, which are ordinances of God's own appointing.

Digitized by Google

2. The other thing I am to remark in the close of this discourse is, that whatever necessity there be of an external absolution, yet there is still a greater necessity of the internal qualifications of men's own minds in order to receive it. These qualifications are, a true faith, a true repentance, and new obedience of life; which are the Gospel conditions, required to make any human absolution effectual to our pardon. God may, and sometimes does (where there is no contempt), dispense with the want of the former, but he never dispenses with the latter: for "without holiness no man shall see the Lord." It is neither confession nor attrition, nor an external absolution of any kind, but only a sincere conversion, that will qualify us for his pardon: and, therefore, as ever we expect to be absolved in heaven, we must prepare ourselves with those qualifications, which alone can give us security at the day of judgment. God of his mercy inspire us all with these most necessary qualifications, through the intercession and merits of the great High Priest of our profession, Jesus Christ, our blessed Lord and Saviour. To whom, &c.

Digitized by Google

# SERMON II.

JOHN, xx. 23.

*Whosesoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever Sins ye retain, they are retained.*

IN the former discourse upon these words, I proposed three inquiries to be made, concerning the doctrine and exercise of ministerial absolution:—

I. To examine into the nature of this power in general, as it belongs to man: because, notwithstanding the commission and authority granted to man, there is still a vast difference to be made between the power of forgiving sins, as exercised by God, and as exercised by man.

II. To examine more particularly into the nature of the several sorts of absolution, as exercised by man.

III. To inquire how far all men are concerned to submit to the exercise of this power in the several branches of it.

I have already discoursed of the two first, and now proceed to the third inquiry. In resolving of which it will be proper to consider the question distinctly, with respect to the four several branches of ministerial absolution: the absolution of the two sacraments; the declaratory absolution of the word and doctrine; the precatory absolution; and the judicial absolution of public discipline. Concerning all which it has already been observed, in general, that so far as either the sacraments, or preaching of the word, or public prayer, or public discipline, are of any use and force in the Christian Church; so far the absolutions are to be embraced, that attend any of these Divine institutions. I shall now make a more particular inquiry into the necessity of each of them.

1. I begin with the necessity of sacramental absolution. Concerning which it must be asserted, that whatever necessity there is of receiving the sacrament of baptism, or the

Digitized by Google

Lord's supper, appointed for all who have opportunity to receive them; there is the same necessity of receiving the sacramental absolution that depends upon them: because they are so intimately united and linked together, that they cannot be separated from each other; neither does God dispense with the want of sacramental absolution in any case, but where he dispenses with the want of the sacraments themselves. God can indeed, and often does, dispense with the want of the sacraments, and supply them by his extraordinary grace, where, either by the frowardness of his ministers, or their neglect, or some unforeseen accident, or natural incapacity, there is no possibility of receiving them:[a] but men's own neglect or contempt of his ordinances will, doubtless, be imputed to them as a crime, for which they must expect to give account to the sovereign Author of these institutions at his great tribunal. So, in the like cases, if men, through any unavoidable necessity, want the absolution which is exhibited in these two sacraments, God can supply this defect, and by his extraordinary grace grant them absolution in some other way: but if men are justly debarred by the ministers of God from the sacramental absolution, or pardon of sins, belonging to these sacraments, not by any necessity, but only for their own contumacy, in refusing to qualify themselves by the performance of such conditions as are required of worthy receivers; in this case the minister's act, in retaining their sins, and refusing them this sacramental absolution, because he judges them apparently unqualified for it, and unworthy of it, will doubtless be ratified and confirmed by Christ, as the supreme Judge, and asserter of his own authority, given unto men to retain sins, and deny absolution to those who are professed despisers and contemners of the conditions upon which he has offered it. And this plainly shews what necessity there is of absolution, as that signifies, in the first place, the absolution of the two sacraments, which is to be granted to the worthy, and (as far as human judgment can go) to no other but those that are worthy of it. Therefore men are to

[a] See the sense of the ancients upon this point, Orig. Eccles. vol. iii. p. 297, Book x. chap. ii. sect. xx. xxi. &c.

Digitized by Google

prepare for this absolution, for the same reasons that they are to prepare for the reception of either of the sacraments, which, in the ordinary methods and ways of dispensing God's grace, are made the necessary means of salvation.

2. In the next place, for the declaratory absolution of the word and doctrine. Whatever necessity there is of having the truth of God's promises operatively and effectively applied to men's souls, in order to work in them faith and hope, repentance and new obedience: that very necessity there is of this general declaratory absolution, either at first to create and excite, or afterwards to foment and cherish, these good qualities, upon which the pardon of sins depends. "Faith," we are told, "comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." And men do not ordinarily *hear without a preacher*, nor ordinarily *preach, except they be sent*. Therefore, as it is necessary that men should *believe and repent, and obey the Gospel;* so it is necessary they should hear the general declarations of pardon which God has made in his Gospel, on the one hand, and the declarations of wrath revealed from heaven on the other hand, in order to engage them to comply with those terms, upon which the Gospel makes the remission of sins to depend. And as the heralds of the Gospel are obliged to preach and declare the mind of God toward repenting and unrepenting sinners; so every man is concerned to *hear, and fear, and do no more presumptuously*, as he expects to find favour and mercy of God at the day of judgment. This is the necessity and use of declaratory absolutions, both to beget and to support that faith, which is the first spring and foundation of a Christian life. It is the word of God, whereby "we are begotten to a lively hope through the Gospel." And we may reasonably suppose, that faith will last no longer than the preaching of the Gospel does in the world. When Antichrist is come to his full height, and seated in the meridian of his kingdom; when, instead of Gospel truth, he shall fill men with error by "signs and lying wonders, and all deceivableness of unrighteousness;" then will be verified what our Saviour has predicted, "When the Son of Man cometh, shall he find faith on earth?" It will be impossible

Digitized by Google

to maintain faith generally among men, without the constant declarations of the Gospel to support it: and that, if any thing, may convince us of the necessary use of a true Gospel ministry, or such an order of men as have authority and commission to declare the will of God, to keep the very faith itself from dwindling into nothing.

But I told you, that besides the general declarations of the Gospel, there was sometimes a more particular declaratory absolution necessary to relieve a distressed and wounded conscience, and extricate a desponding and doubtful sinner out of the fears and perplexing labyrinths of sin: and the very necessity of comfort to the feeble-minded, in such a case, is a sufficient argument of the necessity of such an absolution. For whither should an anxious and afflicted soul betake herself, but to those whom God has appointed as proper helps and judges in the case? Whose office invests them with something of authority, and whose studies and experience qualify them to search and examine into the nature of spiritual diseases, and then judge of proper methods of cure, and apply suitable remedies to them. Should such a soul fly immediately and solely to God? That, indeed, would be very well, had she sufficient faith, and courage, and confidence, to approach him: but he is the person whom she has offended; and now she thinks of nothing but his wrath and indignation. Should she betake herself to the Son of God, the great intercessor and mediator between God and man? All would be right in this case too, could she come with full assurance of faith to him, as to a merciful and faithful high-priest, who is both able and willing to save to the uttermost all that truly turn to him. But that is her great misfortune, and her very disease, that she dares not come now so "boldly to the throne of grace, to find help in time of need:" or, if she does come even with prayers and tears to Christ, she is afraid they will not be accepted; because she can now hardly look upon him as her Saviour, but as her offended Judge. She is overwhelmed and confounded with her own ingratitude, to think that she was once, like an angel of light, pure and immaculate in the blood of Christ; but now she has deserted her station, and is fallen from grace. She

Digitized by Google

was once enlightened, and had tasted of the heavenly gift, and was made partaker of the Holy Ghost, and tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come: but now she is fallen away, and has crucified to herself the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame. She has trodden under foot the Son of God, and counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith she was sanctified, an unholy thing, and has done despite to the Spirit of grace. And how shall she make her addresses to Christ, whom she has thus shamefully abused? What then? shall she call in the assistance and counsel of the holy angels? They are ministering spirits, indeed, sent forth to minister to those who are heirs of salvation; but their ministry is wholly spiritual and indiscernible: they maintain now no visible intercourse with men. But she has need of some visible comforter, to whom she may lay open her grief, and take his advice in the midst of all her sorrows; and this must be some of her visible fellow-creatures: and who so proper among these, as those whom God himself has appointed for this purpose? Private men may shew their charity to such a languishing soul, as far as their knowledge and their abilities will direct them: but yet, after all, there may be a necessity of some further assistance. And whence may that more reasonably be expected, than from the mouths of those whose "lips should preserve knowledge;" whose studies are the Holy Scriptures; whose business is to explain them to men; to solve their doubts, and take off their scruples; to examine their repentance, and compare it for them with the rule of God's word; and chiefly to guard them against the wiles of Satan, and teach them not to wrest the Scripture to their own destruction. For this is commonly the most difficult part in this whole affair with such distressed souls, to fortify them against the subtilties of Satan, who transforms himself into an angel of light, and teaches them to plead Scripture against themselves; making that which was designed for their health and strength, become to them an occasion of falling; and robbing them of their peace by that very instrument, which was intended to raise their hopes, and fix their consolation. Indeed, this is Satan's master-

Digitized by Google

piece of temptation, to accost and tempt us in Scripture dialect, and with the tongue of an angel: and he never speaks more like himself, that is, more artfully subtle and diabolical, than when he speaks to us the language of heaven. Thus he tempted our Saviour himself, by quoting Scripture; by saying, Thus and thus it is written. And what wonder, then, that he should use the same weapon against other men, who are less able to resist him? But the weaker men are, and the more they are liable to temptation, the greater necessity there is, in that case, that they should have recourse to some abler hand, who can give them both succour and direction; who can rightly apply the word of God to their souls, and give them a right apprehension both of God and themselves; who can set every text of Scripture, which Satan abuses, in its proper light; and so baffle all his arguments, and countermine all his plots, by the same instrument that he abuses, with a design to beguile men and overthrow them.

It would be well indeed, if all men could so dexterously use the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, as that they might be able of themselves (like our Saviour in his temptation) to answer and repel all Satan's sophistry and false glosses upon the holy text, by juster comments and more pertinent allegations. But if this cannot be expected from the weaker sort, it is necessary they should, in such cases, betake themselves for help to those that are more experienced, and have their senses more exercised to discern between good and evil.

Common reason and interest direct men what to do, when they are under any doubts or difficulties in all other concerns. He who doubts his title to a temporal estate, thinks himself obliged to consult an able lawyer, and take his advice and counsel: and in case of a bodily distemper, every man as readily betakes himself to a skilful and experienced physician: and there is the same reason in spiritual distempers to engage a man to consult a spiritual guide, who may be presumed to be as learned and skilful in his profession as either of the former: his office obliges him to a more general and exact study of the Scriptures; to be



Digitized by Google

more expert and accurate in resolving cases of conscience, and more ready and prepared to answer all the objections, doubts, and scruples, that either the natural weakness of men's own fancies, or the subtlety of Satan, throws in upon their minds. His business and employment is to understand the nature of God, and his religion, and his laws, and the extent of his mercy, and the terms of reconciliation to penitent sinners. He can, therefore, examine men's transgressions, and judge of their repentance and condition, better than themselves. Besides all this, he is constituted by God to be his minister here upon earth, for these very purposes: not only in Christ's stead to beseech them to be reconciled to God, and to shew them the method of reconciliation, and to pray for them; but also upon an impartial view of their condition, if he finds them real penitents, to declare them absolved by God, and in his favour: his commission is to assure them, that in spite of all that Satan can suggest to the contrary, there are no sins so great that God cannot pardon, provided they bring the condition of pardon, which is a true repentance: and he can judge, though not with an infallible judgment, yet with a moral certainty, whether their repentance be sincere and perfect; and give them directions to supply it where it is defective; and free them from all unreasonable scruples, which are apt to discompose and trouble their souls: all which must needs be of extraordinary and sovereign use to persons in such a condition, and afford them the surest relief, and the most solid comfort and satisfaction, that can be expected, without a particular revelation, on this side heaven.

So that the use and advantage of spiritual guides, in such a case, sufficiently discovers the reasonableness and necessity of making application to them, in order to obtain the benefit and comfort of a particular declaratory absolution.

And upon this account, our Church, though she lays no necessary injunction upon men to make a particular confession of their sins to her ministers in all cases, yet wisely requires them in this one special case of exigency, to do it for their own benefit and satisfaction:—"If there be any of you, who by this means cannot quiet his own conscience

Digitized by Google

(viz. by confession to God alone), but requireth further comfort and counsel, let him go to some discreet and learned minister of God's word, and open his grief; that by the ministry of God's holy word, he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness." This I take to be the true state of the case, as to what concerns the necessity of a particular confession and a particular declaratory absolution. It is not simply necessary for all men, but only for those whose condition is such, that they cannot have peace and satisfaction without it: and, therefore, the Church of Rome is highly to blame, which imposes the absolute necessity of a particular confession, and a particular absolution, universally upon all men, in all cases of mortal sin, under pain of damnation. Our Church keeps closer to the rule of Scripture and the practice[b] of the ancient Church, in making particular absolution only necessary to those, to whom the necessity of the case itself makes it so. And so much for the necessary use of a general or particular declaratory absolution.

3. The next part of our inquiry is, concerning the necessity of a precatory absolution: and of this there is the same necessity that there is of the prayers of the Church for pardon of sins. We have observed before, that prayer usually accompanies all other sorts of absolution, and is an ingredient, and, as it were, the form of some of them. The sacraments are ordinarily administered with prayer; and prayer always immediately follows the declaration of God's will and intention to pardon penitent sinners, in our public liturgy; and prayer is the means commonly used to reconcile a scandalous offender, who for his crimes has been judicially cast out of the Church, and is now to be received again to peace and favour: so that, as necessary as any of those absolutions are, so necessary is the absolution of prayer, that always so necessarily attends them. If it be necessary, at first, for a man to be released of his sins by the sacrament of baptism, it must be equally necessary for

[b] See the practice of the Primitive Church in relation to auricular confession, Orig. Eccles. vol. vi. p. 464, Book xviii. chap. iii. sect. i. &c.

Digitized by Google

him to be admitted a member of Christ by the prayer, which the administration of that sacrament either includes or supposes: if he would have absolution by the eucharist, he must receive it with that usual form of prayer, which the Church has appointed to be used in the distribution of it. If he would have the general or particular declaration of God's will to pardon sinners made effectual to his own absolution, he must join with the minister interceding with God for the pardon of his offences. And if, after any excommunication for any scandalous offence, he would be admitted formally into the communion of the Church again, he must implore God's mercy by the public ministry and prayer of his priests; because that is the rite and ceremony of such an admission.[c]

4. And hence it follows, in the last place, that when men are formally and judicially cast out of the Church, by the power of the keys, for any scandalous offences, there is a necessity they should have as formal and judicial an absolution, by an authentic relaxation of their bonds and censures, to restore them again to the peace and privileges of church-communion. For if the excommunication be just, and according to the rules of Christ's Gospel, they must either sue for an absolution in the way that he has appointed, or else the bonds that are laid upon them, will stand in full force against them, and their excommunication and expulsion from the Church on earth, will exclude them from the kingdom of heaven. I say, if their excommunication be just and legally founded: for it is one thing, when men are unjustly cast out of the Church, and excommunicated without reason, by the rash exercise of a mere tyrannical and arbitrary power; and quite another thing, when they are legally censured for their impenitency, and obstinate persisting in flagrant and notorious crimes, to the scandal of the Church, and reproach of Christ's holy religion. In the former case, there is no danger to be feared from excommunication, because it is unjust: but, in the latter case, it is the most dreadful sentence that can be passed upon earth against man; because what is done upon earth, will be ratified in

[c] See Orig. Eccles. vol. vi. p. 550, Book xix. chap. ii. sect. iv.

Digitized by Google

heaven, and pursue a man unto the day of judgment, unless a timely and sincere repentance and reconciliation intervene to retract the sentence: which abundantly shews the necessity of this sort of absolution, and of all such things as are previous and necessary to obtain it. Men must truly repent of the crimes which have given the scandal; make humble and public confession of their sins before the Church; modestly submit to her discipline, and give evident tokens of their hearty sorrow for having offended God and man: and then, after such satisfaction made, to convince the Church of their true repentance by bringing forth fruits meet for it, they must sue to the same hands to admit them to communion, which, under Christ, were the instruments of taking it from them: and they, by the same authority wherewith they cast them out of the Church, will receive them again; making prayer and intercession to God for them; and declaring them absolved from the bonds they were under, and now fully restored to all the privileges of Christian communion. But without such a proper satisfaction as this, if men continue obstinate in their sins, in a careless impenitency, or contumacious neglect or contempt of the Church's censures; they may be assured, that an account of these misdemeanours, added to all their other sins, will be required of them another day; when Christ will vindicate the authority of his ministers in all their just proceedings, and confirm their sentence by his unalterable approbation.

What allowances God will make for some men's weakness, or ignorance in this affair, belongs not to us to determine. Neither would it be charitable in us, positively to condemn every man that dies excommunicate in *foro externo*, without an actual relaxation of his bonds, when he was truly penitent, and desirous to be reconciled to the Church; but only some unforeseen accident and unavoidable exigency prevented the execution of his good intention. In this case the Church has generally accepted the will for the deed, and declared such to be virtually in her communion after death:[d] in like manner as they who die without baptism or the

[d] See Orig. Eccles. Book xix. chap. ii. sect. xi.

Digitized by Google

eucharist, not by any contempt, but by some pressing necessity, are charitably supposed to die in God's favour by virtue of their faith and repentance, because they do not despise God's ordinances, but heartily desire them. But the case is otherwise with men that live and die in contempt of the Church's discipline and censures: if such men perish, they may thank themselves for it; the Church has no power to absolve those who will not be absolved: if they suffer their sins to be retained on earth, they will be retained in heaven, and follow them to the day of judgment.

And so I have done with the third inquiry, How far all men are bound to submit to the lawful exercise of the ministerial power of retaining and remitting sin; or what necessity there is of absolution in the several cases now before us.

It now only remains, that we reduce this whole consideration to practice, and shew what are the proper uses of this doctrine, both as it relates to the ministers of Christ and his people.

As to the ministers of Christ, there is no doctrine in the whole body of Christianity more forcible than this, to engage them either, first, to purity and holiness of life; or, secondly, to diligence in their studies and labours; or, thirdly, to fidelity in dispensing the mysteries of Christ, and care in their proceedings with penitent and impenitent sinners.

1. In the first place, the commission of power to ministers to retain and remit other men's sins, in whatever sense we take it, is a great engagement on them to lead holy and pure lives themselves. For it looks like an absurdity in practice, and is too often really thought so, that men should be qualified to forgive other men's sins, who are loaded with guilt and impurity themselves. There is nothing so natural and obvious as, "Physician, heal thyself:" and therefore, if it be not a real objection against their office, yet it is an unanswerable one against their persons. If it do not destroy the tenour of their commission in the nature of the thing, yet it certainly diminishes their authority and reputation in the opinion of men; when every profligate sinner can retort upon them, and say, "Thou that teachest another, teachest

Digitized by Google

thou not thyself? Thou that preachest, A man should not steal, dost thou steal? Thou that sayest, A man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonourest thou God?" It must needs take off very much from the veneration of the sacrament of baptism, to have a man pretend to wash away the sins of others, who is himself polluted and profane; and equally diminish the reverence which is due to the tremendous mystery of the eucharist, to have it ministered with unholy hands. It cannot relish well with men, to hear an unsanctified mouth give blessings to others, who in effect is cursing himself; praying, that the blood of Christ may preserve others to eternal life, whilst he himself "is eating and drinking his own damnation, not discerning the Lord's body." But, above all, such a man cannot, with any tolerable decency or freedom, discharge the office of punishing and correcting others, who is himself more justly liable to rebuke and censure. With what face can he debar others from baptism or the eucharist, who is himself unqualified to receive either? Or exclude others from the Church, who is himself unworthy to enter into it? Nothing, therefore, can be a greater engagement upon ministers to lead holy and pure lives, than the consideration of the commission which Christ has given them to retain or remit other men's sins, whether in a sacramental way, or a declaratory way, or a precatory way, or a judicial way: because without purity they can by no means answer the end of this office, and the nature of their trust; but their mal-administration will rise up in judgment against them, and condemn them.

2. A second thing, which this office of retaining and remitting sins requires of ministers, is great diligence in their studies and labours, without which they can never be able sufficiently to discharge it. The Church, indeed, has made some part of this work tolerably easy, by a prudent provision of many proper general forms of absolution; such as the forms of administering the absolution of the two sacraments, and many general forms of declaratory and precatory absolution; to which in her wisdom she may add proper forms of excommunication and judicial absolution. But

Digitized by Google

when this is done, there still remains a great deal more belonging to the full discharge of this office, for which the Church can make no particular provision; and, therefore, that must be left to the industry and diligence of ministers in their particular studies and labours. And this requires both a diffused knowledge and great application, to be able to understand the nature of all God's laws, and the bounds and distinctions betwixt every virtue and vice; to be able to resolve all ordinary cases of conscience, and answer such doubts and scruples as are apt to arise in men's minds; to know the qualifications of particular men, and the nature, and degrees, and sincerity of their repentance, in order to give them a satisfactory answer to their demands, and grant or refuse them the several sorts of absolution, as they shall think proper, upon an impartial view of their state and condition. He that thinks all this may be done without any great labour and study, and a diligent search of the Holy Scriptures, the rule and record of God's will, seems neither to understand the nature of his office, nor the needs of men; nor what it is to stand in the place of Christ, and judge for him between God and man. "The priests' lips should preserve knowledge;" and a man that considers the large extent of that knowledge, together with the great variety of cases and persons, to which he may have occasion to apply it, would rather be tempted to cry out with the apostle, "Who is sufficient for these things?" And if this be not an argument to engage a man to industry in the office of a spiritual physician, it is hard to say what is so.

3. But as this consideration is an argument for purity and industry, so it is no less an engagement to fidelity also. "It is required in stewards," the apostle tells us, "that a man be found faithful;" and more especially in those who are "stewards of the mysteries of God," because that is the greatest concern of any other. It was Moses's argument to temporal judges, Deut. i. 17: "Ye shall not respect persons in judgment, for the judgment is God's." And the argument will hold much stronger in spiritual judgment, because the consequence of the decisions is of greater importance. Here, then, a just medium is always to be observed between

Digitized by Google

flattery and an imperious stiffness and moroseness; between too great indulgence on the one hand, and too great severity on the other. The judgment is God's; and therefore men are neither to be absolved nor condemned at the mere arbitrary will of the minister, but by the rules prescribed by the sovereign Lord. If men are either to be received into the Church, or to be cast out of it, the only thing here to be regarded, is their performance or not performance of the conditions which the Gospel requires. No true penitent is to be denied absolution in any kind; no impenitent person, for any favour or respect, to have the benefit of it. If men are qualified for baptism or the eucharist, it is not in the minister's power, properly speaking, to deny them the privilege of either. If they are utterly unqualified, it is not in his power to admit them to either, if he will be just to his commission, and faithful to his trust. So neither can he, with an equitable judgment, declare the impenitent to be absolved, nor retain the sins of the penitent: for this is "slaying the souls that should not die; and saving the souls alive, that should not live." It is "making the heart of the righteous sad, whom God has not made sad; and strengthening the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life," as God complains of the false prophets by the prophet Ezekiel, chap. xiii. 19–22. All this is a manifest abuse of the ministerial power, tending directly to discourage virtue, and encourage vice; and all such judgments God himself will reverse, and punish the mal-administration of his unfaithful stewards. For, as in all cases, so especially in this, he that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, even they both are abomination to the Lord. Nothing, therefore, is more necessary in the "stewards of the mysteries of God, than that they be found faithful;" giving to every man his proper portion,—peace to the righteous, and terror to the wicked: otherwise they are threatened to have their portion with the hypocrites, where shall be weeping, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth. "It is a Pharisaical arrogance," St. Jerome says,[e]

[e] Comment. in Matt. xvi. tom. ix. p. 49. See the place at length, Orig. Eccles. Book xix. vol. vi. p. 558, chap. ii. sect. vi.

Digitized by Google

"for a bishop or a priest, under pretence of having the keys of the kingdom of heaven, to assume to himself the power of condemning the innocent, or of absolving the guilty." He that does so, abuses his commission, and must expect to give account to God of his illegal administration.

Thus we see what ties and obligations this doctrine lays upon the stewards of God, to be first, holy; secondly, diligent; thirdly, faithful in their service. Let us now see what influence the same doctrine ought to have upon all God's people.

And here I shall not insist upon any personal respect, that is due from them to ministers, as the messengers of God and ambassadors of Christ, but only as a religious regard is to be had to the several parts of the office with which they are intrusted. If God has made them the instruments of remission of sins by those four several ways of absolution; then, at least, it becomes every one to be careful, that he do not, by any wilful neglect or contempt, deprive himself of any one of those methods of expiation.

If baptism be an ordinary means of remission of sins, and so necessary by Divine command, that "unless a man," who has opportunity, "be born again of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;" it highly concerns all men, who are unbaptized, to present themselves and their children to Christ's holy ordinance, that they may receive the promised remission of sins, and spiritual regeneration. For though zealous martyrs and pious catechumens may be saved in an extraordinary way, yet that is not the condition of despisers.

Again, if the eucharist be another means of absolution, then it equally concerns man not to live in the manifest neglect or contempt of that holy ordinance, but to be as frequent as they can in the reception of it, lest they deprive themselves of the grace and pardon exhibited and sealed in that sacred institution.

If the prayers of the Church be likewise a further means of deriving God's blessing upon his people, that must be allowed to be an argument to engage men constantly to attend them: and every man should be glad to say, "We

Digitized by Google

wait for thy loving-kindness, O Lord, in the midst of thy temple."

If the declaratory absolution be of any use and comfort to true penitents, that should make men strive to be among the first and foremost in God's service, and rather wait at the posts of his doors before the service begins, than come dropping in afterwards, as if they were haled into God's presence, when they have lost both the benefit of their own confession and his absolution.

If a particular declaratory absolution be of any use and service to an afflicted conscience and a doubtful mind; that should engage those "who cannot quiet their own conscience, but require further comfort or counsel, to have recourse to some discreet and learned minister of God's word, and open their grief; that by the ministry of God's holy word they may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of their conscience, and avoiding all scruple and doubtfulness."

Lastly, if it be necessary, that when men are excommunicated and cast out of the Church for any scandalous crimes, they should endeavour to reconcile themselves again to God and his Church, by obtaining a judicial absolution; that shews what reverence is due to church-discipline and censures, that are justly past upon them; and that a wilful neglect and contempt of reconciliation, in such a case, may prove more fatal to them than they are apt to imagine; and, in the just judgment of Christ, confirming the sentence of his ministers, finally exclude them from the kingdom of heaven.

But when they have paid the greatest outward reverence imaginable to these ordinances, there is one thing still behind to make them effectual; which if it be wanting, all the absolutions in the world will avail them nothing: and that is, the internal qualifications of their own hearts and souls by an unfeigned repentance and sincere obedience; without which all the rest are but mere forms, that cannot completely operate, whilst men put in bars and impediments against them. For all absolutions are conditional, and suppose

Digitized by Google

repentance and obedience, before they confer any real benefit on the sinner. The minister can only lend his mouth or his hand toward the external act of an absolution; but he cannot absolve internally, much less the unqualified sinner. Christ himself has assured us, that "unless men repent, they must inevitably perish;" and that "unless they forgive men their trespasses, their heavenly Father will not forgive them their trespasses." Now, it would be absurd to think, after this, that a sinner who performs neither of these conditions, should notwithstanding be pardoned by God, continuing impenitent still; and only because he chances surreptitiously to be loosed on earth by some error or fraud, that therefore he should be also most certainly loosed in heaven. This were to imagine one of the vainest things in the world, that Christ, to make his priests' words true, would make his own words false: as they must needs be, if any outward absolution given by a fallible and mistaken man, could translate an impenitent sinner into the kingdom of heaven.

I say not this to lessen the reverence that is due to any of the forementioned sorts of absolution, but that the ordinances of God may have their proper effect upon us, whilst the outward and inward acts go together, to make up the perfect work of an absolution; and that Christ may not say to us at the last day, "These things ought ye to have done, and not to have left the other undone." He that despises an absolution of any kind which God has appointed, despises indeed the ordinance of God: but he that receives it without repentance and obedience, despises the weightier things of the law, and only "strains at a gnat, to swallow a camel." Let not such a man think he shall receive any absolution from the Lord, who thus mangles his institution; who puts asunder what God has joined together; and dares to promise himself security, where God threatens only ruin and destruction. If we would be secure, we must use God's ordinances as he has appointed them; join the outward and the inward act together; let the repentance and obedience of our souls prepare the way for the ministry of his priests: and then what sins they remit upon earth, shall be remitted in heaven; when Christ shall confirm the word of his servants by his

Digitized by Google

irreversible sentence of absolution, saying, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Which God grant unto us all, through the merits of the same Jesus Christ our Lord: to whom, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, be ascribed all honour and glory, world without end. Amen.

Digitized by Google

A

# LETTER

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND THE

## LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER,

CONCERNING THE

## NECESSITY OF ABSOLUTION;

SHEWING HOW FAR THAT NECESSITY EXTENDS, AND WHERE IT CEASES.

---

MY LORD,

HAVING read your question about the indispensable necessity of absolution in all cases whatsoever, I could not but return this speedy answer to it (so far as the time would permit), from what occurred to my thoughts without any tedious inquiry; reserving the further improvement and confirmation of the things here suggested, to a little more diligent search and consideration.

The question about absolution may respect either, I. That absolution which is given upon private or auricular confession: or, II. The general absolution, that is given upon a general confession, as it is in our daily service: or, III. That absolution which is dispensed in the administration of the sacraments, which are indulgences in the true sense,[a] and

[a] See the sacraments proved to be true indulgences and absolutions, Orig. Eccles. Book xix. chap. i. sect. ii. and iii.

Digitized by Google

God's ordinances for obtaining absolution and remission of sins: or, IV. The absolution that is given by the relaxation of church-censures. Now the absolute and indispensable necessity of these several sorts of absolution in all cases whatsoever, is what (I conceive) neither our Church, nor the Primitive Church, ever asserted; though some of them are of much greater necessity than others.

For, I. As to the absolution that is given upon private or auricular confession: that cannot be more necessary than the confession itself, which (except in some particular cases) is only matter of advice, rather than strict duty imposed upon all men under pain of damnation; as our Church, with the Primitive Church, defends, against the Roman imposition and yoke laid upon men's consciences in this particular. I shall not trouble your lordship with any ancient testimonies upon this point, unless you please to require me to transcribe some, which may easily be done out of Chrysostom and many others.[b]

II. As to a general absolution upon a general confession, which is retained in our liturgy, and is a defect in Calvin's;—though it must be owned to be a very useful and edifying part and form of Divine service (which Calvin[c] wished to have inserted into his liturgy, but could not obtain it), yet we cannot say it is so necessary a part of Divine service, as that no Church can have absolution or remission of sins, without such a form of absolution in her liturgy. For this would be an unwarrantable condemnation of all Churches that want that particular form, though they otherwise supply it by preaching, which is the declaratory application of God's promises of pardon to his Church.

III. The necessity of the absolution which is dispensed in the administration of the sacraments, is indeed the same as the necessity of the sacraments themselves. So far, therefore, as the one is necessary, so far the other is necessary likewise. But the necessity of the sacraments is not so absolute and indispensable, as that God cannot, in many

[b] See the testimonies against the necessity of auricular confession, collected Orig. Eccles. vol. vi. p. 464, Book xviii. chap. iii. sect. i. and ii. &c.

[c] Calvin. Epist. de quibusdam Eccles. Ritibus, p. 206.

Digitized by Google

cases (where there is no contempt of his ordinances), save men without the external application of them by the hand of his ministers. For in the case of extreme necessity, where men desire baptism, but cannot possibly have it, God supplies invisibly, by his Holy Spirit, what is wanting in the outward administration. I believe there is not one ancient writer that has spoken upon this head, but has allowed of some exceptions in reference to the absolute necessity of baptism: particularly in two cases: 1. In the case of martyrdom, which they call second baptism, and baptism in men's own blood. 2. In case of a true faith and conversion without martyrdom, when a catechumen was preparing for baptism, and desirous of it, but, by some sudden accident, was taken away before he had any opportunity to receive it. In these two cases they always maintained, that the baptism of the Spirit might be had without the external washing of water. Tertullian, speaking of martyrdom,[d] calls it the Christian's second baptism, and the baptism of blood, of which our Lord spake, when he said, "I have a baptism to be baptized with," when he had been baptized before in water. And he adds, "This is that baptism which both compensates for the want of baptism, and restores it, when men have lost the former benefit of it." Cyprian has the like observation upon the catechumens, who were called to shed their blood for Christ, before they could be baptized in water:[e] "We are not to imagine," says he, "that these

[d] Tertul. de Bapt. c. xvi. (p. 263, edit. Rigalt. Paris. 1641,) (Paris. 1664, p. 230, B. 5.) Est quidem nobis etiam secundum lavacrum, unum et ipsum, sanguinis scilicet; de quo Dominus, 'Habeo,' inquit, 'baptismo tingi,' quum jam tinctus fuisset. . . . Hic est baptismus, qui lavacrum et non acceptum repræsentat et perditum reddit.

[e] Cyprian. Epist. lxxiii. ad Jubaianum, (p. 208, edit. Oxon.) (p. 212, edit. Fell. Amstelod. 1700.) Sciant hujusmodi homines, suffragatores et fautores hæreticorum, catechumenos illos primo integram fidem et ecclesiæ unitatem tenere, et ad debellandum diabolum de Divinis castris cum plena et sincera Dei Patris, et Christi, et Spiritus Sancti, cognitione procedere; deinde nec privari baptismi sacramento, utpote qui baptizentur gloriosissimo et maximo sanguinis baptismo, de quo et Dominus dicebat, 'Habere se aliud baptisma baptizari.' Sanguine autem suo baptizatos, et passione sanctificatos consummari, et Divinæ pollicitationis gratiam consequi, declarat in Evangelio idem Dominus, quando ad latronem, in ipsa passione credentem et confitentem, loquitur, et quod secum futurus sit in Paradiso, pollicetur.

Digitized by Google

men were deprived of the sacrament of baptism: for they were baptized with the most glorious and honourable baptism of their own blood, of which our Lord himself said, 'I have another baptism to be baptized with.'" And he proves, that they who were thus baptized in blood, are also sanctified and perfected by their sufferings, and made partakers of the promises of God, from the declarations made by our Saviour in his Gospel, when he said to the thief upon the cross, who believed in him and confessed him, "To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise."

St. Austin often mentions this argument of Cyprian, and improves it, to shew, that not only martyrdom may sometimes supply the room of baptism, but also a true faith and conversion in case of absolute necessity, when a man has no opportunity to receive baptism.[f] "That martyrdom," says he, "may sometimes supply the place of baptism, is well argued by Cyprian, from the example of the thief, to whom, though he was not baptized, it was said, 'To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise.' Which argument I, considering over and over again, do find, that not only martyrdom for the name of Christ may supply what is wanting in baptism, but also faith and a true conversion of heart, if, through straitness of time, there be no opportunity to celebrate the mystery of baptism. For neither was that thief crucified for the name of Christ, but for the deserts of his own crimes; neither did he suffer because he believed, but only believed whilst he was suffering. Therefore, his case declares how far that saying of the apostle avails

[f] Aug. de Bapt. lib. iv. c. xxii. (tom. vii. p. 56, edit. Paris. 1635,) (Bened. 1700, vol. ix. p. 93, F. 3.) Baptismi sane vicem aliquando implere passionem, de latrone illo, cui non baptizato dictum est, 'Hodie mecum eris in Paradiso,' non leve documentum B. Cyprianus assumit: quod etiam atque etiam considerans, invenio non tantum passionem pro nomine Christi id quod ex baptismo deerat posse supplere, sed etiam fidem conversionemque cordis, si forte ad celebrandum mysterium baptismi in angustiis temporum succurri non potest. Neque enim latro ille pro nomine Christi crucifixus est, sed pro meritis facinorum suorum; nec quia credidit, passus est, sed dum patitur credidit. Quantum itaque valeat etiam sine visibili sacramento baptismi, quod ait apostolus, 'Corde creditur ad justitiam, ore autem confessio fit ad salutem;' in illo latrone declaratum est. Sed tunc impletur invisibiliter, cum ministerium baptismi non contemptus religionis, sed articulus necessitatis excludit.



Digitized by Google

without the visible sacrament of baptism: 'With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.' But then only this invisible operation is performed, when baptism is excluded purely by the article of necessity, and not by any contempt of religion." He argues in another place, from the same example of the thief,[g] "That many are sanctified by the invisible grace without the visible sacraments: but yet the visible sacrament is not therefore to be contemned; because the contemner of it cannot, by any means, be sanctified by the invisible grace thereof."

Hence, it is evident that, according to St. Austin's doctrine, it is not the bare want of an external ordinance, whether sacramental absolution, in the article of necessity, when it cannot be had, but the contempt of it when it may be had, that is pernicious and destructive of salvation. For God is able to supply the invisible grace without the visible means, in such cases, to true believers.

And, upon this ground, St. Ambrose comforts the surviving friends of the younger Valentinian, who was only a catechumen, preparing for baptism, but suddenly slain by the treachery of Arbogastes before he could come to St. Ambrose to receive it. "If any one," says he,[h] "be troubled, that the mysteries of baptism were not solemnized upon him, he may as well conclude, that the martyrs are not crowned, if they die whilst they are only catechumens. But if they be washed in their own blood, then this man also was washed by his piety and desire of baptism."

So that, in such cases of necessity, baptism *in voto* is equivalent to actual baptism. God accepts the will for the deed, when men do what they can do, and where it is not

[g] Aug. Quæst. lxxxiv. in Levit. tom. iv. (Bened. 1700, vol. iii. p. 391, at bottom.) Proinde colligitur invisibilem sanctificationem quibusdam affuisse atque profuisse sine visibilibus sacramentis. . . . Nec tamen ideo sacramentum visibile contemnendum est; nam contemptor ejus invisibiliter sanctificari nullo modo potest.

[h] Ambros. Orat. de Obitu Valentin. (tom. iii. p. 10, edit. Basil. 1567.) Si quia solenniter non sunt celebrata mysteria, hoc movet; ergo nec martyres, si catechumeni fuerint, coronantur. Quod si suo abluuntur sanguine, et hunc sua pietas abluit et voluntas.

Digitized by Google

contempt of the sacrament, but some unavoidable exigency, that hinders their reception of it. Now, then, if in such cases the external ministry of baptism be not absolutely necessary, the external ministry of absolution cannot be necessary neither; for they are the very same act in this particular: and if God can save martyrs and believers without visible and external baptism, he can absolve them without visible and external absolution.

Abundance of authorities[i] might be added more, if there were occasion, in favour of this assertion.

IV. For the absolution which is dispensed by the relaxation of the church-censures: though it be necessary to be sought after by true penitents in all ordinary cases, yet there are several exceptions in cases extraordinary, in which pardon may be had without a formal absolution. For what if a bishop, for unjust ends, or unworthy designs, refuse to absolve a true penitent, when he both gives true signs of repentance, and humbly desires absolution? Will there be no pardon in heaven for him, who is so unjustly and imperiously denied it on earth by men, who exceed their power, which is only given to edification, and not to destruction? Bellarmin indeed says so.[k] "Forgiveness is denied to them, whom the priests will not forgive." But this is carrying the priest's authority to an absolute sovereignty and arbitrary power, which has no foundation in Scripture, or the ancient canons of the Church. For even Pope Gregory the Great could tell these men,[l] "That the bishop, in binding and loosing those under his charge, doth often follow the motions of his own will, and not the merits of the cause: in which case he deprives himself of this power of binding and loosing, who exercises the same according to his own will, and not according to the deserts of those that are subject to him;"

[i] See more authorities of this kind, Orig. Eccles. vol. iii. p. 296, Book x. chap. ii. sect. xx. and xxi.

[k] Bellarmin. de Pœnit. lib. iii. c. ii. tom. ii. p. 1287, (edit. Lugd. 1587.) Negatur remissio illis, quibus noluerint sacerdotes remittere.

[l] Gregor. Hom. xxvi. in Evangel. tom. iii. p. 83, (edit. Antuerp. 1615.) Sæpe in ligandis et solvendis subditis, suæ voluntatis motus, non autem causarum merita sequitur. Unde fit, ut hac ipsa ligandi et solvendi potestate se privet, qui hanc pro suis voluntatibus, et non pro subjectorum moribus exercet. (Paris. 1705, vol. i. p. 1555, C. 10.)

Digitized by Google

that is, his unrighteous judgment is of no value; it is reversed and cancelled in the court of heaven.

The case here is the same as refusing baptism to those who are qualified for it, and very desirous to receive it: the minister's unjust refusal, in that case, is a very great crime; but it will not prejudice the person, that, by such default, is forced against his will, or the will of his parents, to die without it. As Hincmar,[m] archbishop of Rheims, long ago observed for the consolation of those in France, whose children died without baptism, through the perverse obstinacy of Hincmar, bishop of Laon, who refused them baptism, when their parents and godfathers earnestly desired it. "As the benignity of the Almighty," says he, "perfected in the thief upon the cross, what was wanting in the sacrament of baptism, and the communion of the body and blood of Christ, because it was wanting, not through pride or contempt, but by necessity; and as the faith of others, that is, of godfathers or sureties, answering for little children in baptism, is sufficient for the salvation of those who are born obnoxious to original (that is, other men's) sin; so the faith and earnest desire of parents or godfathers, who believe with the heart, and with the mouth desire baptism for their infants, who could not obtain it, because you ordered it to be denied them, shall be of advantage to those infants, by the gift of him, whose Spirit is the author of regeneration; and who blows where he listeth." Whence he concludes, in the case of church-censures, that if a penitent dies without absolution, only because the bishop, for his own will, or any unjust cause, refuses to absolve him; the bishop's unjust judgment and obstinate refusal cannot prejudice the true penitent as to what concerns his salvation and absolution in the kingdom of heaven.

[m] Hincmar. Opusc. l. Capit. c. lxxx. (tom. ii. p.572, edit. Paris. 1645.) Sicut in illo latrone, quod ex baptismi sacramento et communicatione corporis et sanguinis Christi defuerat, complevit Omnipotentis benignitas, quia non superbia, vel contemptu, sed necessitate defuerat; et sicut parvulis naturali, id est, alieno peccato, obnoxiis, aliorum, id est, patronorum, fides pro eis respondentium in baptismate fit ad salutem; ita parvulis, quibus baptismum denegari jussisti, parentum patronorum corde credentium, et pro parvulis suis fideli verbo baptisma expetentium, sed non impetrantium, fides et fidelis postulatio prodesse potuerit, dono ejus, cujus Spiritus quo regeneratio fit, ubi vult, spirat.

Digitized by Google

2. But it may happen, that a man may not only desire absolution, but the minister also may be disposed and ready to grant it him; and yet, by some unavoidable accident, the man may die without it. In this case, the canons have determined, that the want of absolution is no prejudice to his salvation: nor was he to be treated as an excommunicate person, but to be received into the communion of the Church, and to be commemorated among the faithful in the service of the Church, though he died without absolution. The fourth Council of Carthage[n] and the second of Vaison are plain to this purpose.

These allegations plainly shew, what sort of necessity there is of absolution: that it is not the bare want of it, but the proud neglect or contempt of it, when men are under church-censures, that makes it hurtful. But where there is no contempt or neglect, salvation may be had without it. And, therefore, a true penitent, who submits to the Church's discipline, can be in no danger; because, though he may chance to die without absolution, either through necessity, or the obstinate will of his superiors, yet he dies in no neglect or contempt of the Church; and, consequently, has no reason to doubt of God's absolution in heaven.

Your lordship's observation concerning the form, *Absolvo te*, is very just: it is but of a late date, a little before the time of Thomas Aquinas. The ancient forms were all either deprecatory or declaratory, or else consisted in the application of the sacraments of the Church. And the *Absolvo te* is to be reduced to some of the other forms, as the elder schoolmen commonly reduce it: of all which I will endeavour to give your lordship a more full account in my next, taking it for an honour, that you are pleased to command any service of this kind from,

My Lord,

Your most dutiful and

obedient Servant,

JOSEPH BINGHAM.

*Winton, Feb.* 17, 171¾.

[n] Conc. Carth. IV. c. lxxix. Conc. Vaison. c. ii. See more of this, Orig. Eccles. vol. vi. p. 568, Book xix. chap. ii. sect. xi.

Digitized by Google

A

# SECOND LETTER

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND

## THE LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER,

CONCERNING

## THE NECESSITY OF ABSOLUTION, &c.

---

MY LORD,

In addition to my last, upon the fourth sort of absolution, which is the relaxation of church-censures, I have observed the opinion of Cyprian to be conformable to what I wrote before, That if penitents died in the time of their penance, before they could have the bishop's absolution, their salvation was not to be despaired of. For, "The Divine mercy," says he,[a] "is able to heal them: yet we ought not to be too hasty, nor do any thing inconsiderately or rashly; lest, if we over-hastily give the peace of the Church" (that is, restore them to communion before their penance was completed), "we thereby more grievously offend and provoke the Divine indignation." The case was this: Cyprian was now in exile, and some that had lapsed, were very impatient to be restored to communion before his return; which he would not consent to, but ordered them to stay till he should return in

[a] Cyprian. Ep. xii. al. xvii. (edit. Oxon. 1682, p. 39.) Quibus potens est Divina misericordia medelam dare: properandum tamen non puto, nec incaute aliquid et festinanter gerendum; ne, dum temere pax usurpatur, Divinæ indignationis offensa gravius provocetur.

Digitized by Google

peace: and then their cause should be examined before all the Church. If, in the meantime, they died, whilst they were doing their penance, God's mercy was able to save them without a formal absolution, or reception into the external communion of the Church. The learned Bishop Fell gives the same exposition upon the place:[b] "Our author," says he, "rightly opposes the lapsers, who were so hasty to be restored, and stops their mouths with this consideration: that their salvation was not to be despaired of, though they chanced to die before their course of penance was ended."

2. It may be observed further, that, according to the discipline sometimes used in the ancient Church, some very gross and scandalous criminals were denied the communion and peace of the Church, even at the point of death: the design of which was not absolutely to exclude them from heaven; for they still exhorted such to repent, and cast themselves on God's mercy, though they thought fit to exercise such severity and rigour toward them, in debarring them wholly from the communion of the Church, to be an example and terror to others. There are no less than twenty canons, in the Council of Eliberis to this purpose,[c] That if men were guilty of such or such crimes there specified, they should not be restored to communion—no, not at their last hour. The great Council of Sardica has a canon of the like import, to repress some exorbitant usurpations of ambitious men: "Such an one," say they,[d] "shall not be admitted to lay-communion, even at his last hour." Yet they exhorted all such to repent, and, accordingly, admitted them to a state of public and perpetual penance in the Church, at the same time that they denied them communion to the last: as we find in the letters of Pope Innocent the

[b] Cyprian. Ep. xii. al. xvii. (edit. Oxon. 1682, p. 39.) Recte auctor noster hoc sufflamen opponit lapsis, qui ad pacem festinarent, quod non de eorum salute conclamatum sit, quibus ante pœnitentiæ decursum mori contingeret.

[c] Conc. Illiber. c. i. ii. iii. vi. vii. viii. x. xii. xiii. xvii. xviii. lxiii. lxiv. lxv. lxvi. lxx. lxxi. lxxii. lxiii. lxxv. See these canons produced at large, Orig. Eccles. vol. vi. p. 376, Book xviii. chap. iv. sect. iv.

[d] Conc. Sardic. c. ii. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 628.) Τοιοῦτον μηδὲ ἐν τῷ σίλλι λαϊκῆς γοῦν ἀξιοῦσθαι κοινωνίας.

Digitized by Google

first, who says,[e] "The ancient custom was to admit such to penance, but to refuse them communion." And so St. Ambrose writing to a consecrated virgin,[f] who had sinned, bids her "to continue in doing penance all her life, and not expect to be pardoned by human judgment. For she that had sinned immediately against the Lord, was to expect absolution from him alone in the day of judgment."

St. Austin[g] makes the same observation upon such as relapsed into great crimes, after they had once done public penance in the Church, that a second penance was not allowed them in the Church: yet if they turned to God, he would not forget his mercy and patience toward them. In all these cases, therefore, they thought pardon might be had from God, though no absolution was granted them in the Church.

Nor were even the Novatians so rigorous in this matter, as to assert that God could not pardon those sinners, whom they refused to receive into communion, when they had once lapsed after baptism: for they encouraged them to repent, and hope for mercy from God, though they denied that the Church had any power to receive them. This appears from what Asclepiades, the Novatian bishop, said in his discourse with Atticus, bishop of Constantinople, as Socrates relates it,[h] that they dealt with their laity only as the Catholics sometimes did with their clergy, excluding them from communion unto death, and leaving their pardon

[e] Innocent. Epist. iii. ad Exuperium, c. ii. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 1255, C. 7.) Consuetudo prior tenuit, ut concederetur eis pœnitentia, sed communio negaretur.

[f] Ambros. ad Virg. Lapsam, c. viii. (tom. i. p. 137, edit. Antuerp. 1567.) Inhære pœnitentiæ usque ad extremum vitæ, nec tibi præsumas ab humano die posse veniam dari: quia decipit te, qui hoc tibi polliceri voluerit. Quæ enim proprie in Dominum peccasti, ab illo solo te convenit in die judicii exspectare remedium.

[g] Aug. Epist. liv. ad Macedon. (tom. ii. p. 92,) (Bened. 1700, vol. ii. p. 399, B. 10.) Quamvis eis in ecclesia locus humillimæ pœnitentiæ non concedatur; Deus tamen super eos suæ patientiæ non obliviscitur. See more of this, Orig. Eccles. vol. vi. p. 494, Book xviii. chap. iv. sect i.

[h] Socrat. lib. vii. c. xxv. p. 367, edit. Paris. 1678. Ἐκτὸς, ἔφη, τοῦ ἱκανῦσαι, καὶ ἄλλαι πολλαὶ κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς εἰσὶν ἁμαρτίαι πρὸς θάνατον, δι' ἃς ὑμεῖς μὲν [πρὸς] τοὺς κληρικοὺς, ἡμεῖς δὲ καὶ τοὺς λαϊκοὺς ἀποκλείομεν, θεῷ μόνῳ τὴν συγχώρησιν αὐτῶν ἐπιτρέποντες. (Vales. Amstelod. 1700, p. 299, D. 6.)

Digitized by Google

only to God. This account is given of the Novatians by Bishop Fell,[i] Bishop Beveridge,[j] Cardinal Bona,[k] Albaspinus,[l] and others.

Whence it is evident, that though men might be denied absolution on earth, either for discipline's sake, as it was sometimes in the Church; or out of an erroneous opinion, that the Church had no power to receive sinners lapsing after baptism, as it was among the Novatians; yet if they truly repented, they might, notwithstanding, by God's mercy, be received to pardon and absolution in heaven. All these cases do evidently shew it, according to the sense of the ancient Church.

As to the form, *Absolvo te*, it is agreed by learned men, that it was not known in the practice of the Church till a little before the time of Thomas Aquinas, who was one of the first that wrote in defence of it, about the year 1250, against another doctor, who maintained, that the ancient form of absolution in the Church was not this indicative form, but an impetratory form, by way of prayer, deprecation, or benediction; viz. *Absolutionem et remissionem tribuat tibi Omnipotens Deus*, 'Almighty God grant thee

[i] Fell. Not. in Cyprian. ep. xvii. p. 39, (p. 196, edit. Fell. Amstelod. 1700.) Quibus potens est Divina misericordia medelam dare.] In illa erant sententia etiam Montani et Novatiani sequaces, gravissimorum flagitiorum compertos, licet ab ecclesia veniam non obtineant, a Deo tamen posse obtinere.

[j] Bevereg. Not. in c. viii. Conc. Nicæn. tom. ii. p. 68. Neque enim Novatiani ea, quæ iis vulgo adscribitur, opinione fuerunt, ut istis, qui lapsi sunt, aut graviora delicta admiserunt, nullam salutis a Domino consequendæ spem superesse existimarent. Namque ipsi eos ad pœnitentiam agendam sæpius hortari soliti fuerunt et admonere, ut se colligerent, et Divinam indulgentiam supplices implorarent. Sed hoc tantum iis persuasum erat et prædicatum, in ecclesiæ potestate non situm esse, ut quosvis post baptismum (quod unicum pœnitentiæ genus statuerunt) delinquentes ad fidelium communionem admitteret.

[k] Bona Rer. Liturgic. lib. i. c. xvii. n. iii. Cum Novatiani perperam assererent, non esse in ecclesia potestatem peccata post baptismum dimittendi, . . . non quod simpliciter negarent lapsis pœnitentiam, &c. (Antuerp. 1677, p. 399.)

[l] Albaspin. Observat. lib. ii. c. xxi. Quo autem minore negotio ex illis difficultatibus emergere possint, advertant oportet, Novatianorum errorem non in eo positum, quod dicerent neque lapsum neque excommunicatum in morte a peccatis liberandum: sed hæreticos ideo habitos, quod opinarentur Deum ipsum ecclesiæ neque remittendorum, neque retinendorum peccatorum capitalium potestatem copiamque fecisse: &c. (Paris. 1633, p. 311, at bottom.)

Digitized by Google

absolution and forgiveness.' This doctor alleged the authority of Gulielmus Altissiodorensis, Gulielmus Parisiensis, and Hugo Cardinalis; and said, it was not then above thirty years since this new form began to be used. Thus much is collected out of Aquinas, xxii.; *Opusculum de Forma Absolutionis*, cap. v. But we have not that book of Thomas in our library here; and, therefore, I only send you what Morinus, among the Papists—not to mention Bishop Usher[m] or any other Protestant writers—has observed out of him concerning the original of this form, *Absolvo te*. Morinus[n] proves at large, out of all the ancient rituals and Fathers, that the old forms of absolution were all by way of prayer. And it is evident from the ceremony of imposition of hands, which was always accompanied with prayer.

But our quarrel is not with the newness of this form, but with the abuses the Romish Church has affixed to it. For otherwise it may be lawfully used, as our Church appoints in the office of visitation of the sick. But then this power of absolution is only ministerial, not authoritative properly, directly, and absolutely, as our writers commonly word it. It does not empower a priest to open and shut heaven at his pleasure; to absolve without a true contrition, by a sacramental act conferring grace *ex opere operato*, actively, immediately, and instrumentally effecting the grace of justification, as Bellarmin would have it; who makes it also so necessary, that a man is denied forgiveness, if the priest will not forgive him. It may be authoritative and judicial in a ministerial way, as all acts of the ministry are under God. A declarative absolution is so, and an impetratory absolution is so, and an applicatory absolution by the sacraments is so, and a relaxation of church-censures is the same likewise. For all these are done by virtue of power and authority, communicated by God to his ambassadors, as the ministers of reconciliation under him. Only in all these absolutions they must observe certain rules:

[m] Usher's Answer to the Challenge, p. 89, London, 1686.
[n] Morin. de Pœnitent. lib. viii. c. ix. x. &c.

Digitized by Google

which if they do not observe, their absolution avails nothing in the court of heaven.

Now this form, *Absolvo te*, is understood to be no other than the declaratory absolution upon a special and particular case; when a man having confessed his sins, and given signs and indications of a true repentance, the minister declares to him, that as far as he can judge by the rule of God's word, his repentance is true; and therefore, by virtue thereof, he declares him absolved by God: but if there be any illusion or deceit in the man's heart, which no mortal can judge of, then, notwithstanding this favourable sentence and judgment of the priest, God will judge him over again, and rectify the error of the keys by his unerring judgment.

Peter Lombard, among the schoolmen (following St. Jerome among the ancients), gives this as the most probable sense of that kind of absolution. "We can affirm with truth," says he,° "and believe, that God alone remits and retains sins: and yet he has given the power of binding and loosing to the Church; but he binds and looses after one manner, and the Church after another. For he remits sin by himself alone, who cleanses the soul from inward pollution, and looses from the debt of eternal death. But he has not given this power to the priests, to whom yet he has given the power of binding and loosing; that is, of shewing who are bound or loosed. Upon which account, the Lord having first cured the leper by himself, afterwards sent him to the priests, by whose judgment he was to be declared

° Lombard. Sentent. lib. iv. dist. xviii. p. 334, (Lugd. 1594.) Hoc sane dicere et sentire possumus, quod solus Deus dimittit peccata et retinet: et tamen ecclesiæ contulit potestatem ligandi et solvendi; sed aliter ipse solvit vel ligat, aliter ecclesia. Ipse enim per se tantum dimittit peccatum, qui et animam mundat ab interiori macula, et a debito æternæ mortis solvit. Non autem hoc sacerdotibus concessit, quibus tamen tribuit potestatem solvendi et ligandi, id est, ostendendi homines ligatos vel solutos. Unde Dominus leprosum sanitati prius per se restituit, deinde ad sacerdotes misit, quorum judicio ostenderetur mundatus. Ita etiam Lazarum jam vivificatum obtulit discipulis solvendum. Quia etsi aliquis apud Deum sit solutus, non tamen in facie ecclesiæ solutus habetur, nisi per judicium sacerdotis. In solvendis ergo culpis vel retinendis ita operatur sacerdos evangelicus et judicat, sicut olim legalis in illis qui contaminati erant lepra, quæ peccatum signat. Unde Hieronymus, super Matt. xvi. ubi Dominus ait Petro, 'Tibi

Digitized by Google

clean. And having first raised Lazarus to life, he then presented him to his disciples, that they should loose him. For though a man be loosed before God, yet he is not accounted loosed in the face of the Church, but by the judgment of the priest. Therefore the evangelical priest in loosing and retaining sins, acts and judges after the same manner as the legal priest did heretofore, in the case of those who were defiled with leprosy, which is the emblem of sin. Whence St. Jerome, commenting upon those words of our Lord to Peter, 'To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven;' says, 'Some not understanding this place, assume to themselves something of the supercilious pride of the Pharisees, so as to imagine they have power to damn the innocent and save the guilty; whereas before God the only thing that is inquired into, is, the life of the criminals, and not the sentence of the priests.' In Leviticus, the lepers are commanded to shew themselves to the priests, whom they do not make leprous or clean, but only shew who are clean or unclean. So here it is plainly declared, that God does not always follow the judgment of the Church, which sometimes judges by surreption and ignorance; but God always judges according to truth. And in remitting or retaining sins, the evangelical priests have the same right and office as the legal priests had of old, under the law, in curing the lepers. These, therefore, remit or retain sins, whilst they judge and declare them to be

dabo claves,' &c. 'Hunc,' inquit, 'locum quidam non intelligentes, aliquid sumunt de supercilio Pharisæorum, ut damnare se innoxios, vel salvare se putent noxios: cum apud Deum non sententia sacerdotum, sed reorum vita quæratur.' In Levitico se ostendere sacerdotibus jubentur leprosi, quos illi non faciunt leprosos vel mundos, sed discernunt qui mundi vel immundi sunt. Ita et hic aperte ostenditur, quod non semper Deus sequitur ecclesiæ judicium, quæ per surreptionem et ignorantiam interdum judicat: Deus autem semper judicat secundum veritatem. Et in remittendis vel retinendis culpis id juris et officii habent evangelici sacerdotes, quod olim habebant legales sub lege in curandis leprosis. Hi ergo peccata dimittunt vel retinent, dum dimissa a Deo vel retenta judicant et ostendunt. Ponunt enim sacerdotes nomen Domini super filios Israël, sed ipse benedixit, ut legitur in Numeris.

Digitized by Google

remitted or retained by God. For the priests put the name of the Lord upon the children of Israel; but he himself blessed them, as it is read in Numbers, vi."

The Master of the Sentences here cites St. Jerome but imperfectly, and therefore I shall recite his testimony more exactly in his own words: "Some bishops and priests," says he,[p] "not understanding that place (where our Lord says to Peter, 'Whatsoever thou shall bind on earth,' &c.), assume to themselves something of the supercilious pride of the Pharisees, so as to imagine they have power to damn the innocent or absolve the guilty; whereas before God the only thing that is inquired into, is the life of the criminals, and not the sentence of the priests. We read in Leviticus concerning the lepers, where they are commanded to shew themselves to the priests, and if they have the leprosy, they are then made unclean by the priest: not that the priests make them leprous and unclean, but because they had the power of judging who were leprous or not leprous, and might discern who were clean or unclean. As, therefore, there the priest makes the leper clean or unclean, so here the bishop and presbyter binds or looses; not [making] them innocent or guilty: but according to the tenour of his office, when he hears the distinction of sins or sinners, he knows who is to be bound, or who to be loosed."

There seems to be something wanting in the grammar of those words, *Non eos qui insontes sunt vel noxii;* and to make it coherent with what goes before, the word *faciens*, or the like, seems needful to be supplied. But all the rest is very plain, that as the priests of old did not properly make a man

[p] Hieron. in Matt. xvi. (tom. ix. p. 49,) (Venet. Vallars. vol. viii. p. 124, E. 7.) Istum locum episcopi et presbyteri non intelligentes, aliquid sibi de Pharisæorum assumunt supercilio, ut vel damnent innocentes, vel solvere se noxios arbitrentur; cum apud Deum non sententia sacerdotum, sed reorum vita quæratur. Legimus in Levitico de leprosis, ubi jubentur, ut ostendant se sacerdotibus, et si lepram habuerint, tunc a sacerdote immundi fiant: non quo sacerdotes leprosos faciant et immundos; sed quo habeant notitiam leprosi, et non leprosi, et possint discernere qui mundus, quive immundus sit. Quomodo ergo ibi leprosum sacerdos mundum vel immundum facit, sic et hic alligat vel solvit episcopus et presbyter, non eos qui insontes sunt vel noxii; sed pro officio suo, cum peccatorum audierit varietates, scit qui ligandus sit, quive solvendus.

Digitized by Google

leprous or clean, but only declare whether he were so or not; so the priests of the New Testament bind or loose men from their sins, by declaring who are to be bound or loosed.

Bishop Fell, indeed, has a more singular notion of the form, *Absolvo te:* he supposes,[q] that in every crime there are two things to be considered, viz. The offence against God, and the offence against the Church; the former of which is forgiven by God alone upon men's prayers and repentance; but the latter by this authoritative form, "I absolve thee."

But this (though it may be true with respect to crimes that fall under public discipline) cannot well be the meaning of the form as it is used in our liturgy, in the office of the visitation of the sick, which is the only place, as I remember, where our Church appoints it to be used. For, in private sins there is no offence given to the Church, and yet it is private sins, confessed privately to a minister, for which that rubric orders absolution to be given in this form, *Absolvo te.* So that though his interpretation may be good in reference to the Church's public absolution[r] for public and scandalous crimes, which give offence to the Church; yet I think it cannot hold with respect to private crimes, because there no offence is given. Therefore it seems better to resolve it, as St. Jerome and Peter Lombard do, into a declarative form, and explain it by the example of the legal priests cleansing the leper, by declaring him to be clean.

[q] Fell. Not. in Cyprian. de Lapsis, p. 136, (p. 97, edit. Fell. Amstelod. 1730.) Notari autem poterit, in omni delicto duo spectanda occurrere, primo offensam adversus Deum, de qua David (Psalm. li.), 'In te, in te solum peccavi,' in cujus remedium precibus et resipiscentia unice proficitur; juxta illud D. Petri (Act. viii. 22) ad Simonem Magum, 'Pœnitentiam age ab hac nequitia tua, et roga Deum:' secundo intervenire offensam adversus fratres, de qua D. Paulus (1 Cor. viii. 12), 'Peccantes in fratres, et percutientes conscientiam eorum,' &c. Cui amoliendæ venia ab ecclesia ceu parte læsa, et illius nomine ab episcopo qui eidem præest, omnino expetenda est, juxta illud Apostoli (2 Cor. ii. 10), 'Cui autem aliquid donastis, et ego: nam et ego quod donavi, si quid donavi propter vos in persona Christi.' Et quidem quantum ad forum exterius, sive offensam adversus fratres, locum fortassis habere poterit illa auctoritativa, quæ in occidentali ecclesia invaluit formula, qua et usus fuisse videtur Zephyrinus Tertulliani sæculo: 'Ego mœchiæ et fornicationis delicta pœnitentia defunctis dimitto,' &c.

[r] See Orig. Eccles. vol. vi. p. 567, Book xix. chap. ii. sect. vi.

Digitized by Google

I have now sent your Lordship all that I have observed material in this dispute: but if there be any thing omitted or deficient, that you desire should be further considered, your Lordship cannot more readily command, than I shall be ready to obey with the greatest pleasure, who am,

MY LORD,

Your most dutiful and

obedient Servant,

JOSEPH BINGHAM.

*WINTON, Feb.* 24, 17$\frac{1}{2}$$\frac{3}{4}$.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

A

# DISSERTATION

UPON THE

## EIGHTH CANON OF THE COUNCIL OF NICE;

PROVING

THAT NOVATIAN, THE HERETIC, WAS NEVER ALLOWED TO BE A TRUE BISHOP IN ANY PART OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

WITH

SOME REMARKS ON MR. LAWRENCE'S WAY OF HANDLING THE CONTROVERSY ABOUT

## LAY-BAPTISM.



Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

A

# DISSERTATION

UPON THE

# EIGHTH CANON

OF

# THE COUNCIL OF NICE.

---

Some readers might now perhaps expect, that having finished another volume of the Antiquities of the Church, I should pursue again the controversy of lay-baptism with Mr. Lawrence, volume after volume, as often as he thinks fit to demand it. But when a controversy begins to spend itself in mere wrangling, and equivocations, and tedious repetitions, and personal rude reflections, and feigned charges of contradictions, only to swell out a book without much edification to the reader; I think it high time to put an end to such a debate: and therefore I shall give a short and final answer to his last book, by making two or three observations upon the most material parts of it. 1. Upon his notion of 'indelible character,' and his artifice in pretending that I agree with him in owning it, and contradict myself upon it, and allow all that he contends for. 2. Upon his notion of laymen and lay-communion: and of a man's having a right to give the communion, who has no right to receive it. Which I shall shew to be nothing but a splendid equivocation, to dazzle the eyes of his readers. 3. Upon his loose notions of the power and effects of church-laws and authority in annulling uncanonical ordinations; and particularly the ordination of Novatian, the heretic. 4. Upon his sense of the Nicene Canon, which he pretends allowed

Digitized by Google

the Novatians to be true bishops and priests, during their continuance in heresy and schism. As to his flowers of rhetoric, indecent reflections, and ungenteel insinuations, which he every where intersperses to lessen the character of his adversary and his writings; as these have no relation to the merits of the cause, nor any ways affect the present dispute, so I think it below me to take notice of them; and if his admirers are pleased with his way of writing, they may enjoy the pleasure of it, for me, without contradiction.

1. The first thing I take notice of, is his notion of the 'indelible character' of a priest, which he supposes to have such a virtue in it, as to preserve the power and authority of a priest, even after the Church has deposed, degraded, and excommunicated him, and done all she can to take away his sacerdotal power, by withdrawing her commission from him. Now such a notion of indelible character, I have every where denied and utterly rejected: and, therefore, all his quotations out of my writings, as if I had owned an indelible character in his sense, are a mere equivocation and manifest imposition upon the credulity of his readers. The indelible character which I have owned, is the external ceremony of imposition of hands, which may remain upon a man, when the Church has withdrawn her commission, and taken away all sacerdotal power and authority from him. And the meaning of this is no more than that, when the Church thinks fit to recall such a man to his office, and restore him to the power and authority of a priest again, she does it not by a new imposition of hands ordinarily, but only by a new commission. This may be illustrated by the example of the Roman emperors' treating their soldiers, from whose practice the name of the 'indelible character' was first taken. When the emperors took any soldiers into their service, they were used to set a mark or character upon their bodies, to signify to whose service they belonged. Now if any soldier turned rebel against his prince, the emperor immediately withdrew his commission, and took away his office, power, and authority from him; but still his initial character, which he had at his first entrance, remained with him, even after the man was turned rebel, and divested of all authority by his prince:

Digitized by Google

and if the emperor had occasion to recall such an one again into his service, he needed not to do it by a new character, which still remained upon the rebel, but only by granting him a new commission, and thereby restoring him to the office, power, and authority of a soldier again. In this case it would be absurd to say, that a soldier who turns rebel, has his prince's authority and power, when the prince has withdrawn his commission from him, because he still retains the imperial mark or character upon him; which then signifies no more, but that only the man is turned renegado against his prince, till such time as the prince is pleased to restore him to his office and power again: and then the same character will serve to be the mark of a lawful soldier, which, in the time he stood divested of authority and without commission, was only the indication of a rebel. After the same manner it is with Christians: the soldiers of Jesus Christ, when they are first entered into his service, are signed and marked with the washing of baptism, which is the character of the Lord, that distinguishes them from Jews and Gentiles. If after this they turn rebels or apostates, they are no longer entitled to the spiritual rites and privileges of Christian communion; yet still they retain their external character, their first washing of baptism, which, after the greatest apostasy, when they return to their obedience, is never a second time repeated. And so, likewise, when they are entered into a higher degree of Christ's service, his ministry or sacerdotal office, they are signed or marked with another external character, which is, imposition of hands; together with which they receive a commission, power, and authority to act as his ministers in the sacerdotal function. If, after the reception of these, they turn rebels against Christ, and become heretics, schismatics, apostates, or vile and flagitious men; the Church, who first gave them their commission, power, and authority in the name of Christ, has power also, in the name of Christ, to withdraw their commission, power, and authority from them: but still the external character of imposition of hands remains upon them, even after they are turned out of office, and divested of all sacerdotal authority by the

Digitized by Google

Church in the name of the prince; so that if the Church shall think it proper to recall them again into her service, she needs not to do it by a new external character of imposition of hands, but only by a new commission; thereby investing them again with the power, authority, and rites of ministers, which, for their rebellion, she had taken from them. Whereby it plainly appears, that the external character of a priest, which is called 'indelible,' and the commission, power, and authority of a priest, are very different things: the one may be taken away, whilst the other remains: the one is an external ceremony, which may continue with a rebel after he is turned out of commission; the other is a spiritual authority and power, which can last no longer than a man is allowed to continue in his office by virtue of his commission: which commission, when it is once withdrawn by Christ, or by the Church legally in his name, the man has no longer the power and authority of a priest, because he is deprived, by his prince, of the commission which entitled him to it. I believe there is no ordinary reader but what can plainly distinguish these two things from one another: and yet our author is pleased to confound them together, that he might thence infer, that if the external character of a priest remained with him after he was degraded, the spiritual power, commission, and authority of a priest, remained with him likewise: and that I was guilty of a contradiction, in allowing the one to remain, and not the other. Whereas the greatest part of the testimonies I had cited, which our author is pleased to slide over, do shew, as plainly as words can express, that the Church did actually withdraw her commission, power, and authority from degraded and excommunicated priests, at the same time that she left this, which I call the external character of imposition of hands, still remaining with them, so as not to repeat it when she thought fit to receive them into office again by the grant of a new commission: as the emperors were wont to receive their rebel soldiers into office again, not by impressing upon them a new character, but by granting them a new commission. Our author himself makes no question, but that,

Digitized by Google

in the time of Cyprian, the Church did totally withdraw her commission, authority, and power from degraded priests, and thereby reduce them to the state and condition of laymen: but yet she recalled some of these to their station again; not by giving them a new imposition of hands, but only a new commission: as appears in the case of Maximus, the Roman presbyter, who had been the chief instrument in procuring the pretended ordination of Novatian, and was one of the principal men in the schism. Whilst some others, both bishops and presbyters, were reduced to the unalterable state of laymen, there to continue without hopes of restitution; this one man had this peculiar favour shewed him, in consideration that he had been a confessor for the name of Christ, that he was restored to his clerical office again, upon his submission and return to the Church. Yet we do not find that he was admitted again by any new imposition of hands, but only by a new commission, or precept, empowering him to act with authority in his former station. As Cornelius, bishop of Rome, who was the man from whom he received his commission, gives Cyprian an account of the whole transaction.[a] By which any one may judge the commission was a different thing from the imposition of hands; since the one was necessary to be renewed, to restore a degraded priest to his office again, but the other needed no repeating. The Church in after-ages generally observed the same rule: she withdrew her commission from delinquent priests, and reduced them, as the Church in the time of Cyprian and Cornelius had done before, to the state of laymen: and then they were as much laymen, as those in the time of Cyprian, because they were deprived of their commission in the same words and form as those in the time of Cyprian. But yet the Church sometimes restored to these their priestly office again, as Cornelius did to Maximus, not by any new imposition of hands, but by granting them a new commission, and investing them with a new authority and power, which they were deprived of by the Church's censures. So that when

[a] Cornel. Epist. xlvi. al. xlix. ad Cyprian. (Oxon. 1682, p. 93.) Maximum presbyterum locum suum agnoscere jussimus, &c.

Digitized by Google

our author has laboured ever so much, to prove that a degraded priest has still the Church's commission, authority, and power to act as a priest, because he once received an imposition of hands, which is an external character, that he needs not receive again; his labour is all to no purpose: for it is the commission and authority we are inquiring after, whether a man can be said to retain his commission and authority,—when the Church has declared, in the plainest terms, that she has taken all commission and authority from him. Let him retain, if you please, his external character of imposition of hands upon him; let him be one that needs not a new imposition of hands to restore him to the priestly office again; yet he needs a new commission, if he was deprived of it; and must have a new authority, before he can act as an authorized priest again. His indelible character will not preserve his authority, when the Church, by her just authority, has taken his commission from him; no more than a rebel soldier can be said to war by the authority of his prince, when his prince has once taken his military commission from him, although he retain still his prince's signature or character that was given him at his first admission. But this gentleman always takes the character of a priest for his commission, authority, and power: and then it is no wonder he should think a priest cannot lose his authority and commission, but he must lose his character also. But if the character of a priest be a different thing from his commission, as a sign differs from the thing signified, and may be without it, though it many times bears its name; then a priest may lose his commission and authority, whilst he retains his character: and a man who has once received imposition of hands, may always be said to have received the sign or character of the priestly office and power, and to retain the sign, even when the commission and power is taken from him. If men will not distinguish these things, let them enjoy their own confusions: but let them not think hereby to preserve the commission and power of degraded priests, by the amusement of an indelible character, when the Church has once, by her lawful authority, taken their

Digitized by Google

commission from them; nor go on to charge their adversaries with contradictions, which are only of their own inventing.

2. Another thing disputed between this gentleman and me, is concerning the notion of laymen and lay-communion; and about a man's having a right to administer the communion, who has no right to receive it. This author, page 31, of his preface, is very much disturbed that I invented a threefold acceptation of the word 'laymen:'—1. Catholic laymen in the Church. 2. Heretical laymen, who pretended to have a sacerdotal commission, when they really had none. And, 3. Such laymen as once had a true sacerdotal commission, but were afterwards deprived of their commission by the same power of the Church, which first gave it, and so were reduced to the state and condition of laymen again. The first sort of laymen he allows; but the two others are fancies, he says, of my inventing. It is a great happiness in an author when he can say what he pleases, and be believed also upon his bare word. He himself owns, the Cyprianic Churches made such laymen as I contend for, under the third head; that is, such laymen as once had a sacerdotal commission, but were afterwards deprived of their commission, and so reduced to the state of laymen again. And yet, what he himself owns, is now only a notion of my inventing. What would not a man give for such a license as this, to be able to make that which is nonsense in an adversary's mouth, be in his own mouth only an argument of learning and understanding? But he says, he has proved, that these were not laymen in the opinion of those Churches, who held their baptisms to have been valid; —when yet he has not so much as transcribed, much less answered, that cloud of witnesses I produced upon this head:—for the same reason, I presume, that some historians tell us, Bellarmin's works are scarce to be met with in Italy, for fear men who will not read Protestant books, should see the strength of the Protestant arguments in Bellarmin himself, and the weakness of his answers.—The second sort of laymen he turns off, by saying, the Novatians I instanced in, were allowed to be clergymen by the

Digitized by Google

Council of Nice; concerning which, we shall see more by and by. But what if this were so? Can he be ignorant, that there were forty heresies before the Novatians, which perhaps all pretended to have their clergy and priests? which yet were no commissioned priests, although some of their baptisms were received by those Churches, who disputed against the Cyprianists upon this question. If these men were not laymen, or at least no priests, I desire to know what more convenient name to give them; that we may agree upon terms, and end disputing about names and words to no purpose.

Our author's notion of a priest's being reduced to lay-communion, is another fancy of his own inventing, and noways answerable to the design of the discipline of the Primitive Church. For, according to him (page 110), "Reducing a priest to lay-communion, is no more than to oblige him, whilst he is suspended from the execution of his priestly power, to receive the sacrament not among the rest of the clergy in the most sacred place, within the rails at the altar, as was the custom, but among the laity,—in a more inferior, or less honourable part of the church." Whereas it signifies a great deal more in the ancient style and language of the Church: for it always denotes the divesting a priest of his sacerdotal authority and commission, and reducing him to the state and condition of a layman; whereof the receiving the communion without the rails, was but a variable token or appendix. Our author is forced to own, it signified thus in the writings of the Cyprianists. When they speak of reducing a bishop or priest to lay-communion, in them it denotes the making a priest become a layman, or reducing him to the state and condition of a layman: why then does it not signify the same in the writings of Cornelius, when, writing to Fabian, bishop of Antioch, concerning the deposition of Trophimus, one of the three bishops that pretended to ordain Novatian, and giving an account in what capacity he was received into the Church again, he says,[b] "We received him to the communion only as a layman?" When

[b] Euseb. lib. vi. c. xliii. (Vales. 1695, p. 198, C. 11.) Ἐκοινωνήσαμεν ὡς λαϊκῷ.

Digitized by Google

Cyprian says of this same Trophimus,[c] "That Trophimus was admitted into the Church again, but only to communicate as a layman, not to take upon him the place or office of a priest;"—here our author will allow, that to communicate as a layman, signifies the divesting Trophimus of his episcopal commission, and reducing him to the state and order of laymen. But when Cornelius says the very same thing of the same person, and all the canons of the Church say the same of other bishops and priests, whom they degraded, and obliged to communicate only as laymen; then 'communicating as laymen' does not signify their being deprived of their episcopal or sacerdotal commission, or their being reduced to the quality and order of laymen; but only their being obliged to communicate among laymen without the rails of the altar, whilst they were suspended from the execution of their priestly power. But I have said so much to expose this vain notion of lay-communion from the ancient canons and writers of the Church, in the fourth chapter of the Second Part of my Scholastical History, of which our author thought it the most prudent way to take no notice, that I need only refer an inquisitive and ingenuous reader to that chapter for the fullest satisfaction, that whenever the Church speaks of reducing a priest to lay-communion, it means something more than bare placing him among laymen to communicate without the rails of the altar; it means degrading him from his order, and depriving him of sacerdotal authority and commission, and reducing him to the state and condition of laymen.

"But why then," says our author, "do I contradict myself, and own that they have still the character of priests, in some sort, upon them?" If, by the character of priests, he means the commission, power, and authority of priests (which seems ever to be his meaning), then I deny, and have always denied, that there remains any such character after a priest is degraded, and reduced properly to lay-communion. But if, by character, he will content himself

[c] Cyprian. Epist. lii. ad Anton. (Oxon. 1682, p. 105.) Sic tamen admissus est Trophimus, ut laicus communicet, non quasi locum sacerdotis usurpet.

Digitized by Google

to mean no more than I do, viz. the external ceremony of imposition of hands, which may sometimes be separated from commission, authority, and power (as it is in heretical ordinations, where a formal imposition of hands is given without any Divine authority and commission, which heretics have no power to give; and as it is in all degraded priests, when the Church has withdrawn her commission from them); then, I say, it is no absurdity or contradiction to say, the commission and authority of a priest may be taken away, whilst the external character of imposition of hands remains upon him; so far, as that when the Church thinks fit to give him a new commission and authority, she does not think it necessary to give him a new imposition of hands; which is all I mean by a new character. And thus much the Cyprianists allowed, when they had deprived heretical or schismatical priests of their authority and commission, and reduced them to the state of laymen: they did not for all that, when they restored them to their sacerdotal authority, do it by a new character, that is, a new imposition of hands; but invested and reinstated them by a new commission. As appears by the commission given to Maximus at his restoration; which Cyprian approved of, though he had been a ringleader in the Novatian schism, and the principal author of all the confusion. *Jussimus Maximum presbyterum locum suum agnoscere*, was the form of his admission; which implies a new commission indeed, but no new imposition of hands, to restore him to the authority of his ministration. So that the Cyprianists, as well as others, made a distinction between the character and the commission; and when they withdrew the commission, left the character, in the sense that I take the character, still remaining: for they did not restore a degraded and ex-commissioned priest by a new imposition of hands, but only by a new commission. Our author will not distinguish these things, as I do, with the ancient Church, both Cyprianists and others; and that is the ground of all this unnecessary squabble, and his frequent repeated charges of contradictions, with which he should have charged the practice of the ancient Church, and not my representation.

Digitized by Google

Our author has one very pleasant notion more about communion and sacraments (page 41), which I dare say every reader will readily own to be only a splendid equivocation. I had occasion, in discoursing of such priests as are not only degraded, but cast out of lay-communion by the Church, to say of these priests, that they who have no right to receive the sacraments themselves, have no authority to give the sacraments to others: where nothing can be plainer, than that I am speaking of such priests as are actually turned out of office and church-communion by the Church's authority and censures. In answer to this, he forms his reply concerning such priests as are wicked men in themselves, but yet are in actual communion with the Church, and are allowed by her to administer the sacraments, because the Church has passed no censure upon them. And then he quotes the twenty-sixth article of the Church of England, as a proof, that we may use the ministry of wicked men in receiving the sacraments, although such men have no right, in his opinion, to receive the sacraments themselves. Now what is all this but a splendid equivocation? I am speaking about such wicked men as the Church has actually censured, and deprived of all right to receive the sacraments, as well as adminster them, by excommunicating them after she has degraded them: and he proves, that we may use the ministry of such wicked men, as the Church has neither excommunicated nor degraded, but allowed both to continue in communion, and minister in their office also. Such men, indeed, may be unworthy before God either to administer the sacraments or receive them: but so long as the Church, for want of taking cognizance of them, allows them, *in foro externo*, both to continue in communion and their ministry; so long they have an external and presumptive right, *in facie Ecclesiæ*, and before men, both to minister the sacraments and receive them. But when the Church, by her authority, has once deprived them both of their ministry and communion, then they have no right, either before God or men, to minister the sacraments or receive them. And it is of these only I am speaking: concerning which sort of wicked men, the twenty-

Digitized by Google

sixth article of the Church of England has not a syllable, and, therefore, is applied by our author to no purpose, but only by a mere equivocation to amuse an unwary reader. And of this sort are most of the answers our author has made to the arguments which I offered to prove, that degraded and excommunicated priests have not any right to administer the sacraments, when once they are formally censured and divested of their authority by the discipline of the Church.

3. Another observation I think it proper to make, is upon our author's loose notions of the power and effect of church-laws in annulling uncanonical ordinations, and particularly the ordination of Novatian, the heretic. I had occasion to say, the ordination of Novatian, though given him by three bishops, was originally void; because it was given him against such laws of the Church, as declared that the ordination of persons in such circumstances, should be void. These laws I instanced in, were the laws against simoniacal and forced ordinations; the laws against ordaining without a regular and synodical election; and the laws against usurpation and intrusion into a full see. To all which our author answers in general (page 47), that these were only circumstantial irregularities, not essential. Which is not the thing in question; but, whether the Church had not made such laws, and declared, that such irregularities, as were manifest transgressions of those laws, should not make an ordination void, except the Church herself, for just reasons, thought fit to grant a dispensation. It matters not whether they are called essential irregularities, or circumstantial, so long as they are such irregularities, as the Church, in her discipline, declares shall make an ordination void: for then the ordination, with such irregularities, must be void, unless the Church, in some special case, or great exigency (of which she is the proper judge), thinks fit to dispense with her own rules, and accept an ordination, though given contrary to such prescriptions. For I conceive, the difference between an essential and circumstantial irregularity against church-canons is not always, that the one makes an ordination void, and the other not; but rather, that the Church has power to

Digitized by Google

dispense with the one, and not with the other: but if the Church does not dispense with the irregularity committed against her own laws, when they declare that an ordination, given in such circumstances, shall be void,—then the ordination must be void, whether we call the irregularity essential or circumstantial, because it has not the Church's dispensation. Therefore, if our author would have answered any thing to the purpose, he should have proved, either that there were no such laws then in being, declaring an ordination, given with such irregularities as Novatian's was, should be void; or else, that the Church had dispensed with her own laws in this particular case, in favour of Novatian. For this was matter of church-discipline: and the Church has power to make laws about ordinations, and declare what shall stand good, and what not. And she has also power to dispense with her own laws upon just and proper occasions. But every heretic and schismatic, who is in rebellion against the Church, as Novatian was, has not therefore a privilege, whether the Church will or no, to challenge a dispensation.

Suppose Novatian was ordained by three bishops, as our author and I are agreed he was: is there no more required by the laws of the Church toward making a true bishop, but only to have the hands of three bishops, vested with the power of ordaining, to be laid upon him? What, if three bishops should ordain a man who was never truly baptized; would that make him a true bishop? Our author indeed thinks so, because three bishops, invested with the power of ordaining, laid hands upon him: but the Council of Nice thought otherwise, and therefore decreed, "That the Paulianists, who were so ordained bishops, priests, and deacons, should be both rebaptized and reordained," as is undeniable from the nineteenth canon of that Council. So that something more was then thought necessary, beside the hands of three bishops, to make a man a true bishop of the Church. Some personal qualifications were required; as that he should be a Christian truly baptized, to make him a subject capable of a true ordination; else by the rule of that Council, such a formal ordination was void. There

Digitized by Google

were many other rules of the Church, declaring ordinations given in irregular ways, to be void, which more nearly affected the case of Novatian. I could easily instance in twenty things of this kind, but I shall keep to the particulars I before instanced in against Novatian. One was, that Novatian was ordained by a mere stranger, without a regular and synodical election; which sort of ordinations the Church, by her rules, declared void. Our author, therefore, ought to have shewed, either that there was no such rule in the Church, or that Novatian was not so ordained; or else, that the Church, upon some weighty reasons thought fit to dispense with his irregularity, and make a particular exception to her rule in his favour. Instead of this, he only tells us, "This did not null the ordination of Novatian: for if it did, then the acts of all bishops, priests, and deacons, done irregularly out of the places of their own jurisdiction, will be null and void: and so, if a priest baptizes out of his own parish, intruding into another man's district, without his leave and consent, or without any necessity at all, the baptism he administers must be null and void, if a bishop's act of ordination be null and void, for his having performed it irregularly out of his own diocese and jurisdiction." I cannot but pity readers that must be imposed upon with such argumentation as this. The fallacy of it lies in this, that things of a different force are made to be of the same importance. The Church in one case has made a rule, that ordinations, given in such an irregular circumstance as I mentioned, shall be void, and she actually declared the ordination of Novatian void upon this account. In other cases, she has declared, that things done in irregular circumstances, though they be criminal, as done against her rule, yet shall not be void; but only the man shall be liable to a canonical punishment for his trangression. Now, can a man rightly conclude, that because an irregular act is void in one case, where the Church in her discipline and wisdom has declared it shall be void; that therefore all other irregular acts shall be void in other cases, where the Church has expressly declared they shall not be void? As it is in the case of a priest's administering baptism out of his own

Digitized by Google

parish; the thing is an irregular act, but yet the Church has declared it shall stand good for all that: but in the other case, of bishops ordaining a bishop out of their own province, and that in a schismatical way, where one was ordained regularly before, the Church has declared that such an irregular ordination shall be void. Therefore, these are not parallel cases, because the Church herself has made an express difference between them. I dispute not whether the irregularity of such an ordination be essential or circumstantial: it, is sufficient to my purpose, that the Church declares it to be such an irregularity, as shall make an ordination void. Nor is it material to say, that the Church sometimes admitted of such ordinations, and did not actually void them: for that only argues, that the Church has power to dispense with her own rules, and shew favour where she thinks it proper. But, then, it must be shewed, that the Church did dispense with her rule in this particular case of Novatian, and actually shewed him this favour, by owning him as a bishop of the Catholic Church, notwithstanding his irregular ordination: which is the thing I affirm she never did during his whole life, but always rejected him as no bishop, notwithstanding he had three bishops to lay hands upon him, and give him a pretended ordination.

The second thing I urged against the ordination of Novatian, was, that it was a simoniacal and forced ordination; which sort of ordinations the rules of the Church always directed to be declared void. Our author says nothing to the charge of simoniacal ordination, as knowing full well, what the decrees of the Church have ever been in this case. But he makes a long harangue about personal iniquities in ordainers, such as drunkenness, and being drawn to give orders by compulsion, which he thinks does not make void an ordination. "For then, where shall we find valid orders on the face of the earth, since ordainers are but men, and some of them may have been grievous sinners in one age of the Church or other, and thereby may have broken the line of succession irreparably, so as never to be made whole again. Nay, if personal immoralities in those who are bishops, do null their episcopal character, and render the



Digitized by Google

ordinations performed by them null and void, then it will unavoidably follow, that we have no valid orders in the Church of England; since orders were originally conveyed to our clergy by the wicked, immoral bishops of the Church of Rome." And here again, he trumps up the twenty-sixth article of the Church of England, altogether as pertinently as he did before: for he is only fighting with his own shadow: all he says is utterly beside the question; and therefore to no manner of purpose, but only to amuse his zealous and unwary readers. For I am not speaking of such personal immoralities, or wicked men, as the Church has taken no cognizance of, or censured; they whom the Church allows to be in office, must be presumed to be the Church's ministers (though they be wicked men in themselves, and before God, and unworthy of their office), till such times as the Church has deprived them of their office, or declared them incapable by her discipline and censures. But my question is concerning such personal immoralities, as the Church has declared shall make an ordination void: such as simoniacal practices to gain an ordination, and the like; and concerning such wicked men as the Church has found guilty of such practices and immoralities, and actually censured and deprived them, and declared their ordination void, for attempting to obtain an ordination by such irregular practices; as she actually did in the case of Novatian and his ordainers, the one of which she deprived of their office, and declared the ordination of the other to be void, because obtained by such irregular practices. What is this to wicked men, of whom the Church has taken no cognizance; or to such personal immoralities, upon which she has passed no censure? A priest, simoniacally ordained, may pass for a true priest in the face of the Church, and before men, till such time as the Church has discovered his crime, and censured him for it by a legal proof made against him: but if as soon as he is ordained, the Church is acquainted with his crime, and by her legal authority declares his ordination void immediately upon it; then, either that man is no true priest, or else the Church has no authority to declare such an ordination void. Now, this was the case of Novatian: the

Digitized by Google

Church had a law, that ordinations obtained by such irregular practices as Novatian was guilty of, viz. simony, force, and fraud, should be declared void. And this law was actually put in execution against Novatian; no favour or dispensation was allowed in his case; he was condemned by the governors of the Church throughout the world; and not so much as one bishop, except perhaps one or two of his ordainers, who were now themselves degraded, ever owned him for a bishop, or in token of it wrote letters communicatory to him, or received letters communicatory from him. It was not only the Cyprianic Churches that voided the ordination of Novatian, but the Churches of the whole world; the Cornelians and Stephanians at Rome; the Churches of the East and West; the Churches that admitted his baptisms without rebaptizing, as well as those that rebaptized his proselytes; they all agreed that he was no bishop, though they did not agree to reject the baptisms that were given by him and his party, as utterly null and void. Which shews how fairly our author represents the matter, when he says no Churches voided the ordination of Novatian, or other heretics, who did not also make null and void all the acts of their ministration. When it is as plain as the sun at noonday, that the Roman Church, under Cornelius and Stephen, and all the rest that sided with them in the dispute about rebaptizing heretics,—did never rebaptize the Novatians, though they agreed with the Cyprianic Churches that Novatian was no bishop, and concurred with them in cancelling and voiding his ordination. Either, therefore, Novatian was no bishop, as having his ordination declared void for such crimes as the Church thought worthy of such a censure; or else, the Church exceeded her power in declaring his ordination void by such a rule, as she had neither power to make, nor put in execution.

Yet our author will have it, that such a rule would void all the ordinations on the face of the earth, and even those of the Church of England. This is hard, indeed, that the Church cannot make a rule that shall void the ordination of one immoral man, but that must needs void the ordinations of all the world beside. But this is a supposition that

Digitized by Google

destroys itself by its own absurdity. For we must always suppose a Church in being, and governors in it, to put church-laws in execution, before they can operate upon delinquents to void their ordinations. If laws against delinquents did execute themselves without any further examination or process, then there might be some colour to assert, that laws, made to void the ordination of immoral men, might, some time or other, in a very corrupt state of the Church, have endangered the ordinations of the whole. But human laws do not use to execute themselves: therefore, before they can operate effectually upon delinquents, we must suppose some governors of the Church to put them actually in execution: and if they do not, there may be laws to void the ordinations of immoral men, which yet will not effectually take place, because they are not put in execution against them. Now, there may be many reasons assigned, why such laws are not always put in execution against delinquents. Sometimes a very heinous crime, such as a simoniacal ordination, is transacted in private; and, then the Church cannot execute the law against simony upon such offenders; because the fact is a secret, and no legal proof can be made against it. In some cases, again, the Church herself thinks fit to dispense with her own laws, in times of great exigency, or to prevent or cure a dangerous schism; and does not proceed against criminals to the utmost height and rigour of her laws, but allows those ordinations to stand good, which in strictness she might void and cancel. Sometimes again, there is a great want or neglect of discipline in a very corrupt state of the Church; as it was in the prevalency of the Papacy; and then many great offenders may escape the lash of the laws, because there is not a sufficient spirit of government to put the laws in execution against them. In all these cases, the laws that appoint irregular ordinations to be voided, do not take effect; either because the Church is ignorant of the fact; or because, for just and weighty reasons, she thinks fit to dispense with her own laws; or because there is a general neglect or corruption in those that are at the helm, and intrusted with the execution of them. This shews that the laws, by which the

Digitized by Google

irregular ordination of Novatian, for his personal immoralities, was made void, can never destroy the ordinations of the whole Church: because that would suppose the whole Church first to put such laws in execution upon every individual member of her own clerical body, and the very judges to agree universally to condemn themselves: which is a supposition that sufficiently exposes itself at the first view, and destroys itself by its own absurdity. There is, therefore, no danger either, to the ordinations of the Catholic Church, or the Church of England, as our author would insinuate, from the second reason I gave, why the Church voided the ordination of Novatian, for the irregular methods he used to obtain it.

My third reason against his ordination was, That he intruded himself into a full see, where Cornelius was regularly and divinely placed before him. Which sort of ordinations were so much against the laws and rules of Catholic unity, that the Church had agreed by ancient laws to pronounce such ordinations void: and accordingly this law was put in execution against Novatian, and his ordination was declared void by the bishops of the whole world, unanimously, and with one consent, because of his usurpation. This I proved from the undeniable testimony of Cyprian and Cornelius, and many plain laws and canons of the Church. To which our author answers something pleasantly, "That the designation of him to that full see, was indeed a nullity, with respect to his being bishop of Rome; but the ordination of him to be a bishop, was not therefore a nullity." As if a man, who by his ordination was particularly designed to be a bishop of Rome, might be allowed to be a bishop in any other place of the world, save that to which he was particularly designed! And this, against the express will and declaration of the Church too, which always refuted his ordination, as vain, imaginary, and delusive! If he were owned to be a true bishop, why did none of the bishops throughout the world, hold correspondence with him as a bishop at large, though not bishop of Rome? Why did Cornelius say, "His episcopacy was not given him from Heaven, but only taken to himself by fraud and robbery?"

Digitized by Google

If his ordination were Divine, why did Cyprian say universally, that he was no bishop? And does not our author himself labour to prove in other places, that by the strict discipline of the Cyprianic Churches, the ordinations and priesthood of all schismatical and heretical dividers and intruders, were made void and null? How, then, comes Cyprian all of a sudden now to mean only, by the nullity of this episcopacy of Novatian, that it was a nullity purely in his designation to that full see of Rome, but no nullity in the ordination of him to be a bishop? I hope our author will not go so far in vindication of Novatian, as to say, he was no schismatical intruder. If then it be allowed, that he was a schismatical intruder, by the rule of the Cyprianic Churches, our author himself tells us, his ordination was made null and void: and yet here we are told at a pinch, that the nullity was not in his ordination to be a bishop, but in his designation to that full see, with respect to his being bishop of Rome. Ingenious men never want distinctions to help out at a dead lift, but they are sometimes, like other men, unhappily involved in contradictions thereby; which should make them sparing in the charge of pretended contradictions upon others. Our author is certainly in the right, when he says, Cyprian's rule voided the ordinations of schismatical intruders. And is it not according to this rule, then, that Cyprian says, Novatian was no bishop? That he set up a human Church, instead of a Divine? That his new apostles, which he sent to most cities to maintain the foundations of his new institution, were only false bishops? These are not the words of men, who thought that he had his episcopacy by Divine right, and only his designation by human presumption. No; they went upon another principle, that a man who breaks the unity of the Church, is not to be allowed any ecclesiastical ordination. *Nec habeat ecclesiasticam ordinationem, qui Ecclesiæ non tenet unitatem*, are the words of Cyprian, alleged by me before upon this occasion; which, methinks, they who talk so much of the principles of the Cyprianic age, should at least have taken notice of. Now, he that gets himself fraudulently and simoniacally ordained into a full see, against the consent of

Digitized by Google

the whole Catholic Church, does certainly break the unity of the Church; and that, not only the unity of that particular Church, into which he is so ordained, but the unity of the Church universal, which is linked and united to that particular Church by the mutual union of the whole college of bishops one with another, and the common ties of the Catholic communion. So that, he that breaks the unity of a particular Church, breaks the unity of the whole; and every part of the Church universal thinks herself concerned to oppose such an adversary, and assist that particular Church on which the assault is first made, by denying the enemy the privilege of Catholic communion. Now, then, if Novatian broke the unity of the Roman Church by his irregular intrusion, which is not contested; he thereby broke the unity of the whole: and then, by Cyprian's rule, that he that breaks the unity of the Church, cannot have an ecclesiastical ordination, it follows, that Novatian had no ecclesiastical ordination, either in the Roman Church, or in any part of the Catholic Church, by the laws of Catholic communion. Nor, indeed, can it be shewed, that ever Novatian was owned for a bishop ordained by Divine right, all his lifetime, by any beside his own accomplices, in any part of the Catholic Church: but plain condemnations of him, as no bishop, occur every where in all the writers that have spoken of him.

But our author says, "Designation to a particular place is only a circumstance of ordination, the essence of which may be without the circumstance of being possessed of a diocese." Let this be so: for I will not dispute with him about what is circumstantial or essential to an ordination. My question is only, Whether the Church had then any law to declare the ordination of a schismatical intruder to be void, when he used unlawful means to get himself ordained into a full see with this irregular circumstance of intrusion? And, Whether the Church did not actually put this law in execution against Novatian, and declare his ordination void upon this account? It is not at all material to say in this case, that the Church has sometimes allowed of persons being ordained to the episcopal function, without being possessed immediately of any particular district; or that she some-

Digitized by Google

times allowed of two bishops in one city, the one by way of coadjutor to the other in case of infirmity or old age, or to put an end to an inveterate schism: of which I have given some instances in my *Origines*, as exceptions to the common rules in both these cases; out of which our author tries to justify the ordination of Novatian, putting him in the condition of those who are ordained as coadjutors and copartners to another bishop in his diocese, or are ordained at large, ἀπολελυμένως, without being bound to any particular district. But, alas! this little evasion will not serve the turn. For every one certainly must needs see, though I should not inform them, that the case is very different between a man doing a thing with the Church's allowance and consent, by way of dispensation with a common rule; and his doing it altogether against her will, by breaking in knowingly and ambitiously, upon her common rules, with the utmost contempt of her laws and discipline. The Church, as I said before, may dispense with her own rules as she pleases. And, therefore, if a man, for just and weighty reasons (of which the Church is judge), is ordained a copartner or a coadjutor to another bishop by the Church's allowance and consent, there is no harm in it; nor will the Church ever proceed judicially against such a man, to pronounce his ordination void: because, though it was done against the letter of the common rule, yet there was nothing of contempt in it, nor proper breach of the law, as being done by just allowance and dispensation. But Novatian's case was quite otherwise: he was neither ordained copartner nor coadjutor to Cornelius in the see of Rome: he had neither the consent of the legal bishop, who required not his help; nor the consent of the Church, who granted him no dispensation:—but against a known and standing rule, which forbade any man to be ordained by way of intrusion into another bishop's see, under pain of having his ordination voided, he not only ambitiously and simoniacally got himself so ordained, but persisted in his obstinacy and contempt of the laws of the Church:—for which, not only the bishop of Rome, with his suffragan bishops, put the law against simoniacal intruders in execution against him, declaring his ordination a void

Digitized by Google

ordination; but Cyprian, and all the bishops of the whole Catholic Church, joined with them, and confirmed the sentence, never acknowledging Novatian for any thing more than a pretended bishop; one, whose ordination was only human, not Divine; whose right to episcopacy was a mere usurpation against the laws of the Church and the laws of Heaven.

It is in vain for our author now to go about to whiten this blackamoor, set forth in such dark and dismal colours by all the ancients, by offering to compare him with those copartners and coadjutors, which the ancient Church sometimes allowed;—since there is such a vast difference between the Church's allowance and non-allowance; between her dispensing with a law, and condemning a criminal by a law; that they cannot bear any similitude, or be fairly drawn into a parallel. And, if what I have now discoursed, stand good against Novatian, our author will find no relief for him in the Council of Nice, which is the last effort he makes toward proving his ordination to be of Divine right, whilst he owns the designation to the diocese of Rome to be a mere nullity. For, if the ordination of Novatian was judicially declared void by the whole Catholic Church in the age in which he lived, I do not see how the Council of Nice could make it good, fifty years after his death; unless it were by bearing some direct testimony to the Divine right of it, and so disproving all that ever before was said against him.

4. Let us therefore examine, what it is the Council of Nice has said in his favour. The Council says nothing of Novatian himself, but has something concerning his followers, which my opponents take to be a justification of the Divine right of Novatian's ordination. They pretend the Council allowed the Novatians to have derived a true ordination from their founder, as a true bishop; and that the Council allowed the Novatian clergy to be true bishops, priests, and deacons, invested with a Divine commission and authority, during their continuance in their heresy or schism; because she gives them the name of clergymen, bishops, priests, and deacons; and allows them the privilege of abiding or continuing in the same order they were

Digitized by Google

in before. But if this would prove the Novatians to be true bishops, priests, &c., then it would equally prove the Samosatenians or Paulianists, to be true bishops, priests, and deacons: for the same Council speaks of them under the same title of clergymen, who yet were not so much as true baptized laymen: for, by an order of this very Council, they were not only to be reordained, but also rebaptized, because their baptism was so faulty as to need repeating. Which is a certain argument they were not allowed to be properly true Christian priests, though they are distinguished by the name of clergymen; since they were not, in strictness, so much as laymen. I know Mr. Lawrence and Dr. Brett could easily get over this difficulty, by imagining that men might be made true priests by ordination, who never were made true Christian laymen by baptism: but the Council of Nice thought otherwise; and I believe they are the first gentlemen that ever entertained the contrary opinion, that a man might be ordained a true priest, before he was made a Christian by baptism. Heretics, indeed, who were never baptized, may have the name of priests, to distinguish them from those called laymen in the same sect; but neither are the one true priests, nor the other true lay-Christians, before they are baptized, whatever titles or denominations are given them. The Council of Nice gives the Paulianists the name of clergymen; but it does not follow, that therefore she believed them to be truly and authentically commissioned priests of God, because they went by this name in contradistinction to those among them who went by the name of laymen. The canon relating to them runs in these words:[d] "Concerning the Paulianists which return to the Catholic Church, it hath been decreed, that they shall be universally rebaptized. But if any of those in this error, were in time past of the clergy, if they be

[d] Conc. Nic. c. xix. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 37.) Περὶ τῶν Παυλιανισάντων, εἶτα προσφυγόντων τῇ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ὅρος ἐκτέθειται ἀναβαπτίζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐξάπαντος. εἰ δέ τινες ἐν τῷ παρειληλυθότι χρόνῳ ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ ἐξητάσθησαν, εἰ μὲν ἄμεμπτοι καὶ ἀνεπίληπτοι φανεῖεν, ἀναβαπτισθέντες χειροτονείσθωσαν ὑπὸ τοῦ τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκόπου· εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀνάκρισις ἀνεπιτηδείους αὐτοὺς εὑρίσκοι, καθαιρεῖσθαι αὐτοὺς προσήκει.

Digitized by Google

found blameless and irreprehensible, then they shall be rebaptized and ordained by the bishop of the Catholic Church: but if upon examination they be found unqualified, then it is convenient that they should be deposed." Here we see the Council gives the Paulianists the name of clergymen as well as the Novatians, and says, If they were not qualified, they should be degraded from their order. And yet, I suppose, it will be agreed on all hands, unless perhaps Mr. Lawrence or Dr. Brett think fit to gainsay it, that these Paulianists, notwithstanding their being distinguished by the name of clergymen, were not true authorized priests invested with proper powers to minister in holy things, because they were yet unbaptized, and both to be rebaptized and reordained, before they could be admitted as authentical clergy of the Church. They had indeed a formal ordination among them to the office of bishops, priests, and deacons, which they might derive from their founder Paulus Samosatensis, who was once a true bishop of the Catholic Church: but now this succession of bishops and priests among them, was but imaginary and nominal; partly, because their first leaders were degraded for their heresy, and divested of all sacerdotal power and authority; and partly, because they gave ordinations to incapable subjects, that is, to persons never truly baptized, who were to be both rebaptized and reordained, before they could be allowed to officiate as true ministers in the Catholic Church. So that the giving heretics the name of clergymen, only for distinction's sake, when applied to such sects as still kept up a formal distinction between clergy and laity among them, is no argument that the Church esteemed such nominal clergy to be truly authorized bishops or priests; for here the Council of Nice affords us a plain demonstration to the contrary. And it were easy to make out the same observation concerning several other sects, whose pretended ministers went by the name of clergy, and were called sometimes bishops, presbyters, and deacons, when yet, in strictness and propriety, they were not so much as true Christian laymen, having never received a true Christian baptism. Particularly the Cataphrygians

Digitized by Google

and Montanists are said to have had bishops among them. Sozomen says,[e] "The Montanists in Phrygia had their bishops, as well as the Novatians." And St. Jerome says,[f] "They had not only bishops, but an order called Cenones, above these; and a higher degree of patriarchs over them." And yet when we come to examine more strictly what these bishops were, we find they were not so much as Christian laymen; for they were never truly baptized: but were such as had need to be admitted into the Christian Church by the door of baptism. And, therefore, though they were commonly called bishops and clergy; yet they were, in strictness, only nominal and supposed clergy, as the Council of Laodicea, which speaks more accurately of them, properly styles them, ordering even their bishops to be rebaptized. "For," says the canon,[g] "if any return from the heresy of those called Phrygians—though they be of their reputed clergy—though they be of those called chief" (that is, I conceive, patriarchs among them), "they shall be first catechised with all diligence, and then be baptized by the bishops and presbyters of the Church." Nothing can be plainer, than that though these Cataphrygians were sometimes called bishops, yet, in truth, they were only nominal bishops, and placed in the rank of simple catechumens, a degree below laymen, by the bishops of the Catholic Church, who were obliged to rebaptize them, before they admitted them to the common privileges of lay-communion. The Photinian bishops, who derived their pretended ordination from Photinus, bishop of Sirmium, were in the same

[e] Sozom. lib. vii. c. xix. (Vales. 1700, p. 595, at bottom.) Ἐν ἄλλοις δὲ ἔθνεσίν ἐστιν ὅπη καὶ ἐν κώμαις ἐπίσκοποι ἱεροῦνται, ὡς παρὰ Ἀραβίοις καὶ Κυπρίοις ἔγνων, καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἐν Φρυγίαις Ναυατιανοῖς καὶ Μοντανισταῖς.

[f] Hieron. Epist. liv. ad Marcellam. (Vallars. Venet. vol. i. p. 189, C.) Apud nos apostolorum locum episcopi tenent: apud eos episcopus tertius est. Habent enim primos de Pepusa Phrygiæ Patriarchas: secundos, quos appellant Cenonas; atque ita in tertium, id est, pene ultimum locum, episcopi devolvuntur.

[g] Conc. Laodic. c. viii. (Labbé, vol. i. p. 1497.) Περὶ τοῦ, τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς αἱρέσεως τῶν λεγομένων Φρυγῶν ἐπιστρέφοντας, εἰ καὶ ἐν κλήρῳ νομιζομένῳ παρ' αὐτοῖς συγχάνοιεν, εἰ καὶ μίγιστοι λέγοιντο· τοὺς τοιούτους μετὰ πάσης ἐπιμελείας κατηχεῖσθαί τε καὶ βαπτίζεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκόπων τε καὶ πρεσβυτέρων.

Digitized by Google

case: though they are sometimes, in common speech, termed bishops, yet they were only supposed bishops: for they, like the Paulianists, were to be rebaptized upon their return to the Church; as appears from the sixth canon of the second Council of Arles made concerning them.[h] The Manichees also had their apostles, and bishops, and presbyters, and deacons, as St. Austin informs us.[i] Fortunatus, against whom St. Austin wrote one of his books, was a presbyter among them; and St. Austin more than once gives him that title.[k] Yet these bishops and presbyters were in reality no Christians. For among many other monstrous errors, for which St. Austin[l] calls them only pseudo-Christians, they had wholly rejected Christian baptism,[m] as the same author assures us; and therefore are always reckoned among those sectaries which were to be baptized upon their return to the Catholic Church. Since, therefore, in all these instances, and forty more that might be added, it is very plain, that when such heretics are called bishops, or presbyters, or clergymen, it cannot be meant that they were persons truly invested with sacerdotal power and authority: because, we see, these names were sometimes given, in compliance with the characters of distinction that men assumed to themselves, even to unbaptized persons, and such as had no right, in strictness, to be called Christians: I think it reasonable to conclude, that when the Council of Nice calls some of the Novatians clergymen, it does not mean, that they were so of right; but only gives them the name by

[h] Conc. Arelat. II. c. xvi. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 1013.) Photinianos, sive Paulianistas, secundum patrum statuta baptizari oportet.

[i] Aug. de Hæres. c. xlvi. (Bened. 1700, vol. viii. p. 13, B. 13.) Ex Electis suis habent duodecim, quos appellant magistros, et tertium-decimum principem ipsorum: episcopos autem lxxii., qui ordinantur a magistris; et presbyteros, qui ordinantur ab episcopis. Habent etiam episcopi diaconos.

[k] Ibid. cont. Fortunatum Manichæorum Presbyterum, tom. iv. — Item Retractat. lib. i. c. xvi. (Bened. 1700, vol. i. p. 19.) Eodem tempore presbyterii mei, contra Fortunatum quendam Manichæorum presbyterum disputavi.

[l] Cont. Faustum, lib. i. c. iii. (Bened. 1700, vol. viii. p. 132.) Tu semichristianos cavendos putas, quod nos esse dicis: nos autem pseudo-Christianos cavemus, quod vos esse ostendimus.

[m] De Hæres. c. xlvi. Baptismum in aqua nihil cuiquam perhibent salutis afferre: nec quenquam eorum quos decipiunt, baptizandum putant.

Digitized by Google

which they were vulgarly distinguished from such others of their sect, as went by the name of laymen.

But how, then, shall we account for that other expression of the Council, which orders these Novatians, μένειν ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ, 'to remain or continue in the clergy?' This, our author thinks, implies that they were in the clergy of right before: otherwise, to decree that they should continue in the clergy, would have been ridiculous, since no man can be said to continue in that which he never was in before. Now I expounded this, by being received or allowed to continue authoritatively among the Catholic clergy, in the same orders which they had pretendedly before. Upon which our author enters into a learned disquisition, whether it was out of ignorance or knavishness, that I expounded the word μένειν, by 'being received?' To which I answer, That if our author's knowledge or charity had been as great as he pretends, he would have known, or at least charitably imagined, that I had some other author beside my own brain for expounding the word μένειν, 'received.' For, indeed, I expounded it just with the same ignorance or knavishness, as some of the ancients had done before me. Particularly Innocent, bishop of Rome, who was contemporary with St. Austin, having occasion to consider this very canon, expounds it in the same manner as I did. First, he gives a verbal translation of the canon,[n] which I also did, and there both he and I agree to translate μένειν, let them 'remain' in the clergy. Afterward, he proceeds to expound the sense of the word, and then it is, 'let them be received;' if the Latin word, *recipi*, which I hope our author, as much as he is given to contradiction, will grant me, do but signify 'to be received,' in English. The words of the canon, according

[n] Innocent. Epist. xxii. ad Episc. Macedon. c. v. (Labbé, vol. ii. p. 1274, D. 11.) Prius ille canon, a patribus institutus, ponendus est. De his, inquit, qui nominant seipsos Catharos, id est, mundos, et aliquando veniunt ad Catholicam ecclesiam, placuit sanctæ et magnæ synodo, ut accepta manus impositione, sic maneant in clero. Possum vero dicere de solis (hoc) his Novatianis esse præceptum, nec ad aliarum hæresium clericos pertinere. Nam si utique de omnibus ita definirent, addidissent, a Novatianis aliisque hæreticis revertentes debere in suum ordinem recipi. Ruffin (book i. chap. vi.) renders it, In ordine suo suscipi debere.

Digitized by Google

to Innocent's translation, are these: "Concerning those who call themselves *Cathari*, that is, 'Puritans,' and sometimes come over to the Catholic Church, it hath pleased the great and holy synod, that when they have received imposition of hands, they shall so remain in the clergy." Then he gives his exposition of the canon in the following words: "But we may say that this order was made for the Novatians only, and did not appertain to the clergy of other heresies. For if they had defined so concerning all others, they would have added, that they who return from the Novatians and other heretics, shall be received into their own order." Where, we may observe, 1. That to remain in the clergy, and to be received into their own order, is the same thing. 2. That they were to have imposition of hands, and so be received into the clergy of the Catholic Church. 3. That all other heretics had their *clerici*, or 'clergy,' as well as the Novatians. And yet, 4. That this was a peculiar privilege granted to the Novatian clergy, and not to the clergy of other heretics. It remains, therefore, to be inquired, What that privilege is, which was allowed to the Novatian clergy, and denied to the clergy of other heretics. Our author thinks it was, that the Council allowed the Novatian clergy to be true authorized clergy, whilst they continued in heresy or schism, before they came over to the Catholic Church. Whereas the Council says nothing of this; but forasmuch as there had been an ancient and general rule in the Church, that no heretical clergy should be allowed to bear the same office in the Church, which they had borne before among heretics, this rule should be dispensed with in favour of the Novatians; and they, by an act of grace, should be allowed to continue in the same order or office that they acted in before among heretics. This is not to justify the Novatian ordinations, much less those of all other heretics, who could lay a much fairer pretence to episcopal ordination than the Novatians could; but only to grant the Novatians a peculiar privilege of being admitted to serve in the clerical office of the Church, which, by the general discipline of those days, other heretics were denied. The reason of admitting the Novatians, was not that the Novatians had

Digitized by Google

better ordinations than some others that were refused; but because the Council was minded to shew a particular favour to the Novatian clergy, which other heretical clergy should not lay claim to; that is, to continue in the clerical office by a particular dispensation, while others, by the general rule of the Church, were utterly discarded. And yet, even this privilege was not allowed the Novatians in all places, after the Council of Nice. For at Rome they never admitted any heretical clergy to any clerical dignity whatsoever in the Church. Which we learn from this same Epistle of Pope Innocent, which says,[o] "It was the law of the Roman Church to give lay-communion only, to such as were baptized by heretics, when they came over to the Church, but not to admit any one of them to the least honour of a clerical office in the Church." So that, whatsoever ordination the Novatians pretended to, they were not allowed to remain or continue in the clergy of the Roman Church. Nor were they admitted in other Churches, as being true authorized priests before in their heresy of schism, but were allowed the favour of a new commission, to continue them in that station, which, without any right or authority, they had only usurped before. And this was a privilege, which the Council did not grant to all heretical clergy; but only to the Novatians and Paulianists, upon respective injunctions; obliging the one to have a new commission, if not a new formal ordination; and the other, to have not only a new ordination, but also a new baptism; because, though the Paulianists could pretend a better title to an episcopal ordination than the Novatians could, yet they were never truly baptized; and, therefore, were not only to be reordained, but to be rebaptized, before they could be allowed to continue or remain in the clergy of the Catholic Church.

But our author thinks it were ridiculous in the Council to decree, that they should continue in the clergy, if they were not in the clergy before. I own, in strictness, it is

[o] Innocent. Epist. xxii. c. iv. Nostræ lex est ecclesiæ, venientibus ab hæreticis, qui tamen illic baptizati sint, per manus impositionem laicam tantum tribuere communionem, nec ex his aliquem, in clericatus honorem vel exiguum subrogare.

Digitized by Google

not the most proper way of speaking, to prevent a critical wrangler from raising disputes upon it; but yet it is a very common and usual way of speaking, almost upon all occasions: as when we say, Men are to be rebaptized or reordained; this, in strictness, would signify, that they had been once baptized or once ordained truly before: otherwise, to a nice critic, it would be ridiculous to say, a man should be rebaptized, who was never baptized before; or reordained, who was never ordained before: and yet this is that ridiculous, improper way of speaking the Church has commonly used about these matters. So, in like manner, when the Council of Nice says, "The Novatian clergy shall remain in the clergy of the Church," our author may call it ridiculous, if he pleases; but wiser men will still understand it to mean, that they were to be made true clergymen by the authority of the Church, who were only clergymen in pretence before; as he is said to be rebaptized, who was never truly baptized, but only in pretence before. But none can better expound the sense of the Nicene Council than the Council itself, which, in a parallel case, concerning the Paulianist clergy, uses a way of speaking, that, according to our author's criticisms, will be as ridiculous. For in the nineteenth canon, it says, "The Paulianist clergy, if they were found unworthy, should be degraded." But now a sharp critic would ask, How could it be said, without nonsense, that they were clergymen, who were never truly baptized or ordained; or, how could they be said to be degraded from their clerical order or degree, who were never truly in any order or degree of the clergy? As it is plain enough these Paulianists never were, in the opinion of that Council; and yet it makes no scruple to say, These clergymen should be degraded. What can be the meaning of this, in the judgment of any candid reader, but only, that the Council, in a vulgar and large sense, call them by the common name of 'clergymen,' because they had some pretence to the clerical order by a formal but fictitious ordination; and says, They should be degraded or deposed from their order, which yet they never truly had, because they made some pretence to an order, which the Church would not allow them to



Digitized by Google

have received authentically before? The Arabic translation of this canon, both according to the version of Turrianus and Abraham Ecchellensis, makes this matter something plainer. I will set it down in their own words. The seventeenth canon, according to the version of Turrianus (Con. tom. ii. p. 296), runs thus:—"Si quis ex hæresi Pauli Samosatensis convertatur ad fidem Ecclesiæ, debet iterum baptizari: et in quocunque gradu ecclesiastico antea fuerit, si convertatur digne et cum humilitate, et ejus vita anteacta reprehendi non possit, sed laudari potius; restituendus est in gradum suum, et imponendæ ei manus, ut imponi solent ei cui nunquam antea impositæ fuerunt, cum benedictione diaconali, id est, quæ fit super ministros Ecclesiæ. Sed is aliquis eum accusaverit, et non fuerit dignus gradu propter malam fidem et prava opera, non est ordinandus." The other translation of Ecchellensis has it thus (Can. xviii. p. 322):—"Iterum baptizandus est, quicunque revertitur ad fidem Ecclesiæ Apostolicæ ex hæresi Pauli Samosateni. Quicunque vero eorum in aliquo extiterit gradu, placueritque ejus reversio, &c., volueritque restitui in gradum suum, restituat illum episcopus, et imponat ei manum, ac benedicat ut benedici solet qui nunquam diaconalem habuit benedictionem. At si reprehensibilis extiterit, et gradu illo indignus habeatur . . . nec sic restituatur, nec ad ipsum admittatur diaconatum." Here we see the Paulianists are said to be in an ecclesiastical or clerical degree, and are to be restored to their clerical order, if they were worthy of it: but yet they are to be restored to it first, by a new baptism, and then a new ordination. And if they were unworthy, they were not to be restored to it, even by a new ordination. What means, restoring them to their order in this place, but only allowing them to be reordained? Or what means, degrading them, but only not allowing them to take orders in the Church? And that by a known figure called *catachresis*. It certainly does not mean, that they were in any true order or degree of the clergy before; but only that they should enjoy no privilege of clergymen, either from their former pretended ordination, or from any real or authentic ordination by the Church, which is forbidden to be given them,

Digitized by Google

because they were unworthy of it. We see what work a severe critic might make with this common expression, and call it ridiculous nonsense, to say, A man may be degraded, who had never had any clerical degree, from which he might be degraded; since, according to our author's nice way of exposition, no man can be said to continue in that, or be restored to that, or degraded from that, which he never was in before. And yet thus the Council of Nice expressed itself in these two parallel cases, which a candid reader may easily understand; but a critic will torture them to a very untoward sense, if he comes to handle them with any design to serve a purpose.

I know not what impression this account may have upon our author; but I believe it will satisfy all indifferent judges, that the Council of Nice, in calling the Novatians by the common name of 'clergy,' or appointing them to remain in the clergy, did not intend to reverse the judgment of the whole Catholic Church before, which had declared Novatian to be no true bishop, and his followers no true priests; but only gave them the names by which they were commonly distinguished in their own sect, and allowed them the privilege of being made Catholic priests by the Church's authority and commission: which was a privilege not commonly granted in those times, when the strictness of discipline wholly excluded heretics from ever attempting to be admitted into the dignity of any clerical order, even after their return to the Catholic Church.

If it were otherwise, how could St. Ambrose have said, after the Council of Nice, "That the Novatians were no true priests, nor could lay any claim to sacerdotal power?" If the Council of Nice had declared Novatian to be a true bishop, and the rest that were ordained by succession from him in their heresy, to be true bishops and priests; how should it enter into the head of St. Ambrose to contradict the Council in so plain a case, and be peremptory in his sentence against them, when the Council had declared so much in favour of their priesthood? Or, why should Pacianus, in his disputes with the Novatians, after the Council also, charge them as being no priests, and Novatian himself

Digitized by Google

as no bishop, if the Council had declared in favour of their priesthood? Is it reasonable to suppose, either that these men were ignorant of what the Council had determined, or that they would set up their own opinion in opposition to the Council's determination? How easy had it been for the Novatians to have replied upon them, that their priesthood was allowed by the Council of Nice; which was then the greatest authority in the Catholic Church.

If the opinion of modern authors signifies any thing in this cause, I might add the judgment of Dr. Maurice[p] and Du Pin,[q] who have declared their sentiments about Novatian, that he never was a true bishop. For they rightly observe, that the first bishop who ever broached a heresy in the Church, was Paulus Samosatensis, bishop of Antioch (an. 237). There were forty-four Christian heresies before this, but never a bishop among them. Novatian was the founder of one of these sects; but Dr. Maurice denies that ever he was a bishop, or any thing more than a Roman priest; and says, the first heretic bishop that we find, is Paulus Samosatensis, who succeeded Demetrian in the bishoprick of Antioch, in the year 262, and who fell into heresy in the year 267, which was at least twenty-six years after Novatian had set up his heresy in the Church. Now, how can this observation stand good, if Novatian had been a heretic bishop so many years before? There had at least been one heretic bishop before Paulus Samosatensis, which yet these learned men positively deny.

And what shall we say of all those other forty-three heresies, that had never a bishop among them? What sort of succession of priests had they to administer baptism to their converts? Shall we say, They had true priests, who had no bishops? Or shall we say, Their false priests never baptized any persons, but such as were rebaptized, when they came over to the Catholic Church? This cannot be. For the very dispute that was on foot in Cyprian's time, between him and Pope Stephen, about rebaptization, shews, that many of those who were baptized by these heretics,

[p] Maurice's Vindication of the Primitive Church, p. 285.
[q] Du Pin, Eccles. Hist. vol. ii.

Digitized by Google

were received into the Catholic Church, by imposition of hands only, without rebaptizing. For that was the very thing contended for by Stephen, and the rest of the Church, against the Cyprianists, that such as had been baptized in the name of the Trinity by those heretics, who retained baptism in its due form, needed not to be rebaptized upon their return to the Catholic Church. Now, then, if there were no bishops among those forty-three heresies, I would ask, Whether there was any succession of true priests among them? If there were no priests among them; by whom were those persons baptized, who were afterward received into the bosom of the Catholic Church without any new baptism? Not by a true priest certainly, since it appears they had none, but only in the name and pretence, which will not give a false priest true authority and power. So that, for aught I can see, not only the Novatian heresy, but all the other forty-three heresies, that arose in the same compass of time, were destitute of episcopacy and sacerdotal power. And yet the Church made no scruple to receive those, that were baptized in due form in those heresies, without rebaptization.

But do we not commonly say, That all the ancient heretics retained the orders of bishops, priests, and deacons; and that the first who disputed about this distinction of orders, was Arius, in the middle of the fourth century? This is commonly said indeed; but unless it be duly qualified, and taken with a little distinction, it will be far from being true. These ancient heresies were not begun by bishops, nor had they any real or true bishops among them. Some of them had presbyters, and others only laymen, for their founders: but they all aped the discipline of the Church, and created to themselves nominal and fictitious bishops, presbyters, and deacons; that they might seem to have the face of a Church, by keeping up the several orders of the clergy among them. Thus, as I have shewed before, the Montanists had not only their bishops, presbyters, and deacons; but their cenons, and patriarchs, or chiefs, above these. And the Manichees had their bishops, presbyters, and deacons, and their masters, and apostles, above the rest. And so,

Digitized by Google

probably, all the other forty-three heresies might imitate the Church in observing these distinctions of orders among their pretended clergy. And so this matter never came to be disputed. But still, among all these called bishops, there was not one true bishop, that could legally derive his authority and power from any other founder than such as were founders of the several heresies, which were either presbyters or laymen. Therefore, though there were those who had the name of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, among them, yet we see they were only nominal, fictitious, and titular; they were created by an incompetent power, and so were faulty in their first original. So that it was not these three real orders of bishops, presbyters, and deacons; but only the face and name of these orders, that they kept up among them. And yet, there is nothing more certain, than that many persons, who were baptized by these heretics who had no real priests among them, were, upon their return to the Church, received without rebaptization. Some of the heretics, indeed, had wholly rejected water-baptism; and others had changed or corrupted the form of it; and all such were rebaptized: but the rest, who retained both the matter and form, were admitted without repeating their baptism, though there were no real, but only feigned and nominal priests among them, to administer it. Which is a further demonstration, that the Novatians were not the only heretics that wanted a true episcopal ordination; nor the only persons whose baptism was admitted, though administered by men who had no real title to the authority and rights of the Christian priesthood.

But our author says frequently, that if the Novatians were not truly ordained bishops and priests, then the Council of Nice admitted them to be priests, who had no more than a lay-ordination. To which I must reply, as I did before, that they had now the Church's authoritative commission, which they wanted before; and that, upon our author's own principles, is sufficient to distinguish a priest from a layman. For, he says, "If a layman have the bishop's commission to baptize in case of necessity, he is so far made a priest by his commission." Since, therefore, the

Digitized by Google

Council of Nice gave the Novatians at least a new commission and authority, which they had not before, she cannot be said to admit them to be priests, who had only a lay-ordination. For the commission which she gave them, was a true episcopal commission, which our author owns to be the substantial part of an ordination, and which bishops sometimes give without the external ceremony of imposition of hands; as in the case of commissioning laymen to baptize in one particular case, which, according to our author, so far makes them priests, without the solemnity of laying hands upon them. And, I believe there want not instances of men's being appointed to preach publicly in the Church, which I think is one part of the sacred function, which private men, without authority, may not take to themselves, without any other designation than the bishop's commission, by patent or word of mouth, both in the ancient Church and the Church of England. Since, therefore, the Novatians had an authentic commission from the Council, they cannot be said to be made priests merely by a lay-ordination, though it were demonstrated, that the imposition of hands, commanded by the canon, does not relate to a new ordination. And yet I know not who can demonstrate that it was not a new ordination: for some ancient versions of the canon call it so. In the tomes of the Councils there are two ancient versions, one of which calls it simply imposition of hands; but the other expressly styles it ordination, saying,[r] "If any are minded to come over from the Novatians to the Catholic Church, it pleases the holy synod that they shall be ordained, and so remain among the clergy." And Gratian cites a like version in his Decree,[s] from whence he concludes, that the Council appointed the Novatians to be ordained upon their return to the Church. And this, he says, was only by way of dispensation: for, by the ancient

[r] Conc. Nic. c. viii. Con. (Labbé, tom. ii. p. 47.) Si qui voluerint venire ad ecclesiam Catholicam ex Novatianis, placuit sancto concilio, ut ordinentur, et sic maneant in clero.

[s] Gratian. Caus. i. quæst. vii. c. viii. Similiter ex dispensatione etiam in Niceno Concilio, c. viii. de Novatianis statutum est, ut ad ecclesiam redeuntes ordinentur: 'Si qui voluerint venire,' &c. See preceding note.

Digitized by Google

and general rule of the Church, no heretics were to be promoted to any clerical order whatsoever, but were to remain of the quality of private men or laymen in the Church all their days. But the Council dispensed with this general rule; and made a particular exception to it in favour of the Novatians, to encourage their more speedy and general return to the Catholic Church, that they should have the privilege of being ordained, and so of remaining among the Catholic clergy; which, by the strictness of former discipline, was denied to all heretics, except any, after the same manner, could plead the Church's favour and dispensation. Ruffin likewise, in his ancient translation of this canon,[t] interprets their remaining among the clergy after imposition of hands, so as to mean, their being received in their order only by a new ordination. Where we may observe also, that, according to Ruffin, a man may be called a clerk, though he has no just title, but only a pretence to real orders; and, with good sense be said, from that pretence, to be received in his order, or remain in his order, which, in Ruffin's opinion, is the same thing, even when he wants a new ordination to make him a real and true authorized clerk. Though our author, because I say this, is pleased to send me to the school-boys for correction, who himself, if he had consulted ecclesiastical writings more than the dictionaries and school-boys he refers me to, had better understood the language of the Church. Or, if he had but consulted Morinus,[u] he would have directed him to Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, and the sixth Council of Carthage, and some other ancient writers, who understood the Nicene Canon as appointing the Novatian clergy to be received by a new ordination. And Morinus himself is clearly of this opinion: and I shall freely own, that though I once thought otherwise, yet now, from the force of so many ancient testimonies concurring in this sense, I think it more probable, that it means a new ordination. I am not so stiff to any opinion

[t] Ruffin. lib. i. c. vi. Et Catharos, qui apud nos Novatiani sunt, si forte pœnitentes ad ecclesiam comvertantur, confessos ecclesiastica dogmata, clericos in ordine quidem suo suscipi debere, sed ordinatione data.

[u] Morin. de Ordinat. Exerc. v. c. xii. n. x. &c.

Digitized by Google

advanced in my *Origines*, but that I can easily depart from it upon better conviction. Though, if our author could demonstrate certainly, that it does mean a new ordination, that would not justify the ordination of Novatian, condemned so many years before by the Catholic Church, whose sentence was never reversed by any competent authority in his favour. The Church might admit the Novatians in after-ages, by a new commission, which is the essential part of an ordination, though she did not repeat the external ceremony of imposition of hands, as what had been formerly given them before, but without competent authority to invest them with a spiritual and Divine commission, which was not ordinarily to be had but from the allowed governors of the Church.

So that, upon the whole matter, there is nothing appears to justify the ordination of Novatian, or to prove him to be a real bishop. The Church universal in his own time agreed in declaring his ordination void: this was done as well by that part of the Church which received the baptisms administered by his emissaries, as that part which utterly rejected them. The Council of Nice did nothing to reverse this sentence pronounced against him, but only dispensed with the rigour of an ancient ecclesiastical law in favour of his successors; that whereas the law forbade any heretics to be admitted to clerical promotion in the Church, the severity of this sentence should not affect such of the Novatian clergy as would return to the Church: they should now have the Church's real commission, who had only a pretended commission before. Or, if we suppose, with so many of the ancients as have interpreted this canon, that the imposition of hands, with which they were to be received, was such an imposition of hands as was given in ordination,—then the matter is still more clear, that the Council of Nice was no favourer of the pretended ordination of Novatian, and yet admitted the baptism given by his successors, who could lay no claim to any just authority or commission from the Church. The reader may add to this those forty heresies which were before Novatian, none of which had any real episcopal ordination, but only in name and pretence, among

Digitized by Google

them: and yet all Churches, except those of the Cyprianic way, received their baptisms, if given in due form, without rebaptization. Let our author, who with such an air of vanity and self-conceit, despises all his adversaries, and pretends so magisterially to correct all their errors in ecclesiastical history, try how many real bishops he can find among those forty heresies (for nominal ones there were enough) to give authoritative baptism to their proselytes; and then, perhaps, we may admire his skill in ecclesiastical antiquity, when he has done a work that none could do before him; and he may be allowed with a better grace to say, the Church never received the baptisms of any but such as were true bishops, of those commissioned by them. Till he has done this, and better asserted the cause of Novatian, it will still stand good against him, that the Church received the baptisms of many who never had any real episcopal ordination; which is the thing I undertook to shew against him.

As to my own concessions formerly made in favour of the episcopacy of the Novatians, or the Meletians, or Arians, after their formal deposition by the Church, I readily consent to the correction of them in my *Origines*, upon better consideration and inquiry into the exact discipline of the ancient Church. I never thought my *Origines* without mistakes, and hope to find time, when I have finished them, carefully to review them; and then I shall not be ashamed, with St. Austin, to write my Retractations, or with Bellarmin, my Recognitions, though the faults our author finds in them, are not the things that need correction.

I have only two things more to note, of lesser moment in this dispute; one with relation to my honoured patron and diocesan, the Lord Bishop of Winchester, and the other in relation to the reverend and learned Dr. Hicks. Our author (page 6 of his preface) charges me for asserting, without proof,—nay, contrary to experience, that all the bishops of both provinces were unanimously of this opinion, that there were other ways of supplying a faulty baptism, than by rebaptization, if given in due form by a layman. He says, I tell my Lord of Winchester this without proof, and contrary

Digitized by Google

to experience: whereas, in truth, it was my Lord of Winchester that told me this, and I am only repeating his words, and telling the world what he was pleased to communicate to me by letter, and order me to publish; which is my proof for what I so delivered. Our author did not think it decent to tell my Lord of Winchester he said a false thing, and, therefore, he persuades his reader to believe it was a groundless story of my inventing. But he says, it is contrary to experience, witness the case of Exeter. What the case of Exeter is, I have no certain knowledge: but if he means, that my Lord of Exeter is of a contrary judgment to the rest of the bishops of England; when he is pleased to declare himself so, I, for my part, shall have nothing to say against it. In the meantime, our author must excuse me for saying what I had just authority to say in reference to what I asserted.

The other thing he charges me with (page 4) is "indecency and uncharitableness to the learned Dr. Hicks," for saying, "I could not but wonder so learned and acute a man should carefully read over his papers, and never observe such a heap of blunders." For this he thinks, I am obliged to ask the doctor's pardon openly for the affront, because the doctor never read over the papers in manuscript, where the blunders were committed. The doctor himself had signified the same thing to me privately by letter, and left it to me to give him what satisfaction I thought proper. And I immediately gave him the satisfaction to acquaint him, I neither said, nor meant, that he had read the papers in manuscript; but I did reasonably suppose he had read them after they were printed, which he did not deny; and that was a year before I made any remarks upon them, which I thought was time enough for our author, if he had been informed, to have rectified them. In answer to which I was told, that the doctor had only read them cursorily, as learned men are used to do books upon subjects they are well acquainted with. So that the sum of my crime, which our author aggravates as such a great "indecency and uncharitableness," is, that I said the doctor had read them carefully; when it appears to have been a little otherwise; which our author,

Digitized by Google

who understands the art of making a mole-hill into a mountain, is pleased to call a "great transgression." And, having said this, I now very friendly take my leave of our author and his subject, declaring once more, as I have frequently done before, that in all I said upon this matter, I intend not to justify the usurpations of any men whatsoever, who assume to themselves the power of baptizing without a lawful commission and authority; but only to assert, what I take to have been the discipline and practice of the Catholic Church, and the Church of England, who have power to determine, in their own discipline, upon what terms, and after what manner, they will receive heretics and schismatics, baptized in due form, into their communion.

Digitized by Google

A

# DISCOURSE

CONCERNING

# THE MERCY OF GOD

TO

# PENITENT SINNERS;

INTENDED FOR

THE USE OF PERSONS TROUBLED IN MIND.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

# DISCOURSE

ON

# THE MERCY OF GOD.

---

PSALM CIII. 13.

*As a Father pitieth his Children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him.*

As there is no quality in God more amiable in itself, or more comfortable in its consideration to human nature, than the attribute of mercy; so there is nothing the Scripture seems more emphatically to impress upon us a firm belief and a right apprehension of, than this. It represents God as delighting and glorying in this character, "That he is merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth; keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin," as God proclaimed before Moses at Mount Sinai (Exod. xxxiv. 6). And the more to make us sensible of this, it condescends to speak to us in the most familiar way, raising ideas of God's mercy in us by things that we are most intimately acquainted with; comparing the actions and disposition of God to those of a tender and compassionate father towards his children. This is very pathetically represented by our Saviour in the parable of the prodigal son (Luke, xv.):—and here, by the Psalmist, in the text, "As a Father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him."

From which words my design is to speak of the mercy of God, not in general, as it relates to all his creatures (for his mercy is over all his works) but as it particularly relates to

Digitized by Google

penitent sinners, who are here described under the character of them "that fear him." In doing this, I shall,

I. Give some eminent instances of God's signal pity and mercy toward penitent sinners.

II. Obviate and answer some difficulties, which often make penitent sinners think they want God's mercy, when they really enjoy it.

III. Apply the discourse in some practical and moral reflections.

In speaking to the first point, I must not now insist, either, first, upon God's sending his Son to die for mankind; though it was a most singular act of God's mercy, recommending his love towards us, "in that, whilst we were yet sinners, Christ died for us;"—nor, secondly, upon God's sending his Holy Spirit to call and prevent us with his assisting grace: because both these are acts of mercy antecedent to our repentance, and offered to sinners in order to make them penitent, and turn them unto God, before they have any power or will to turn themselves. But the acts of pity I am to speak of, are such as God shews to penitent sinners, when they first begin to repent, and are actually on their way to God. And these are three. 1. That he takes notice of the first essays and beginnings of goodness in them, and bears with their weakness, till they arrive to strength and a perfect reformation. 2. That he helps and assists them all along in their progress. 3. That he crowns their endeavours by a kind reception, and complete pardon of all their offences.

1. He takes notice of the first essays and beginnings of goodness in them, and bears with their weakness, till they arrive to strength and a perfect reformation. A father does not expect the same manly service from his children, whilst they are children, as he may require of them, when they are arrived to the state of perfect men: nor does he exact the same measure of activity, labour, or sagacity from those of a weaker frame, or meaner parts and abilities, as he does from those whom he knows to be of a more bright and lively genius, or a more robust and athletic constitution. So, in like manner it is with God in his dealings with penitent

Digitized by Google

sinners: he does not expect, at their first conversion, to find in them immediately all the pleasing graces and perfections of mature and full-grown Christians. There is a weakness, and dulness, and prejudices, and a littleness of faith, which, for some time, he is willing to bear in them, as Christ did in his own disciples. So long as they are hearty and sincere, he does not exact more than they are able to offer him: only he requires their prayers, and endeavours after more grace, that they may go on to perfection. He is pleased to hear a sincere heart cry, "Lord, I believe, help thou mine unbelief!" He considers also, that he has not made all his creatures of the same size and abilities, nor given equal measures and portions of his grace to all alike. Some have more time and leisure, better opportunities, less encumbrances, quicker understandings, and more faithful memories, than others; some have a happier education, and are qualified to consult the oracles of God themselves; whilst others, for the little instruction they get, are forced to be beholden to the charity of others. He does not, therefore, exact the same measures of performance from all alike, but only requires men to be sincere to what they know, and what they are able: "To whomsoever much is given, of him much shall be required: but to whom little is given, of him little shall be required:" only he expects an honest and industrious mind, to do what men are able, according to the proportion of grace that he affords them: and then the widow's mites are as acceptable an offering, as the abundance of others;—and in all other cases, if there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not. For God is pleased with the first appearances of real goodness in his children, and not only accepts them, but helps and encourages them to go on to perfection. "The bruised reed he will not break, the smoking flax he will not quench, till he sends forth judgment unto victory." Which brings me to the second act of God's mercy toward repenting sinners, which is,

2. That he not only bears with their weakness, but helps and assists them all along in their progress, till they come



Digitized by Google

to a full strength and a perfect reformation. This he does by the various methods of his grace; inviting, nay drawing them to himself, by the powerful, though many times invisible, and undiscernible, operations of his Holy Spirit. Which Spirit illuminates their understanding by degrees, and leads them into all necessary truth. He takes off the hardness of their hearts, and corrects the frowardness of their wills. He regulates all their affections, and fixes them to their right and proper objects; giving a new turn and bias to all their inclinations, till they come to a perfect conformity to the will of God. He opens their hearts, and still makes them more and more attentive to the word of God; by the promises whereof he fortifies them against terror and despair, and makes all the seeming difficulties of religion wear off, by adding new strength, succour, and courage, to their first endeavours, and keeping their minds warm in devotion, and fixed and intent upon the business of another world. This good Spirit omits no opportunities of doing them good, but takes all the most proper and seasonable occasions to inspire good thoughts into them. Even a thousand seeming accidents of their lives become providential calls and admonitions to them, whilst the Spirit makes every thing "work together for good to them that love God." By these, and suchlike means (strengthening, not destroying, our natural faculties), a man, who before was weak, nay, dead in trespasses and sins, is not only quickened and set at liberty, but able to say with the great apostle, "I can do all things, through Christ that strengtheneth me." This is the second act of God's mercy toward repenting sinners, that He helps and assists them all along in their progress, till they arrive to full strength and a perfect reformation. Then,

Thirdly, He crowns their endeavours by a kind reception into peace and favour, and a complete pardon of all their offences. Whenever a sinner returns again to him from his evil ways, He immediately lays aside his wrath, cancels his former displeasure, blots out the sinner's ingratitude, forgets his offences, and remembers his sins no more. He retains no secret grudge, or thoughts of revenge, against him: never

Digitized by Google

expostulates the matter with him more about his former life, chides not, upbraids him not with his by-past follies, but passes an act of oblivion upon all his offences, and readily receives him into favour. "If the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, he shall not die. All his transgressions that he hath committed, shall not be mentioned unto him: in his righteousness that he hath done, he shall live," is God's general promise to all repenting sinners (Ezek. xviii. 21, 22). And (Jer. xxxi. 34), "I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more."

In which places we are to take notice of the greatness and extensiveness of God's mercy, together with the readiness and quickness of it; which are qualifications that most eminently recommend it above any thing that is ordinarily to be found in human goodness.

For God pardons readily, not only lesser faults, but those of the greatest magnitude. How great were David's crimes, adultery and murder, ingratitude to God, and forgetfulness of his mercies towards him! And yet, upon his true repentance, God readily pardoned him. He could no sooner make a hearty confession of his sins, but the prophet in God's name gave him a comfortable absolution: "The Lord hath put away thy sin, thou shalt not die" (2 Sam. xii. 13). But there was one sin greater than all these of David put together, which yet God pardoned; and that was murdering Christ his own Son, the Prince of life and glory. Upon which St. Austin makes this discourse, to comfort the greatest of sinners:[a] "Let no man say, I have done such or such a thing, and I fear it will not be forgiven me. What hast thou done? what great sin hast thou committed? Tell me, some monstrous, grievous, horrible crime, which thou art afraid to think of. Let it be what it will: hast thou killed Christ? There can be no fact worse than that, because there is nothing better than Christ. How great a wickedness is it to murder Christ! But the Jews did murder Him, yet many of them afterwards repented, and

[a] Aug. de Symbolo, lib. i. c. vii. Bened. vol. vi. p. 404, E. 8.

Digitized by Google

believed, and drank his blood; and the sin which they had committed, was forgiven them."

This discourse is founded upon St. Peter's sermon to the Jews, which we read of (Acts, ii. 22). Where he first lays before them the greatness of their crime: "Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles, and wonders, and signs, which God did, by Him, in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know: Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and, by wicked hands, have crucified and slain." What then? must they for ever despair of pardon for this? No: "But repent," says he, "and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (ver. 38). And then it follows (ver. 41), "That they that gladly received his word, were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." In the next chapter he discoursed much after the same manner, and with the like good effect: "Ye denied the Holy One, and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you; and killed the Prince of life, whom God hath raised from the dead" (Acts, iii. 14). Yet he does not discourage them from seeking pardon, but gives them assurance of obtaining it, if they would take the proper methods to procure it: which was, "Repent, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." And so it was: "For many of them which heard the word, believed; and the number of the men was about five thousand" (Acts, iv. 4).

These were signal instances of God's mercy, in pardoning the murderers of his own Son, left upon record for our instruction and comfort; that no one might despair of God's mercy, whose sins are not greater than that of murdering Christ.

St. Paul says, he himself obtained mercy for the same reason, that he might be an encouraging example of God's forbearance to all others (1 Tim. i. 15, 16): "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Jesus Christ came

Digitized by Google

into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief." For he was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious, and concerned in the murder of St. Stephen, and others of God's saints, who when they were put to death, he gave his voice against them. "Howbeit for this cause," says he, "I obtained mercy, that in me first" (or in me, the chiefest of sinners), "Jesus Christ might shew forth all long-suffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on him to life everlasting."

But it will be said, All these were sins committed before baptism, which much alters the case: for there is no second baptism for the remission of sins allowed after the first, for those "who are once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance, seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame." To which I answer, That this does not at all alter the case: for though the sins of David, and the Jews, and St. Paul, were committed before baptism, yet they were not before circumcision; which was the same thing to them, as baptism is now unto us, an entrance into the covenant of God, and the visible seal of it. So that as God allowed of a method of expiation, after circumcision; so He does now after baptism, though baptism be now no more to be repeated over again, than circumcision was. For God, in his mercy, as St. Austin observes,[b] has allowed us three ways to obtain remission of sins. 1. Baptism, which cleanses us from all manner of sins, original and actual, great and

[b] Aug. de Symbolo ad Catechumenos, lib. i. c. vii. (Bened. 1700, vol. vi. p. 404, F. 6,) tom. ix. p. 294. Propter omnia peccata baptismus inventus est: propter levia, sine quibus esse non possumus, oratio inventa. Quid habet oratio? 'Dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris.' Semel abluimur baptismate, quotidie abluimur oratione. Sed nolite illa committere, pro quibus necesse est ut a Christi corpore separemini: quod absit a vobis. Illi enim quos videtis agere pœnitentiam, scelera commiserunt, aut adulteria, aut aliqua facta immania; inde agunt pœnitentiam. Num si levia peccata ipsorum essent, ad hæc quotidiana oratio delenda sufficeret. Ergo tribus modis dimittuntur peccata in ecclesia, in baptismate, in oratione, in humilitate majore [majoris] pœnitentiæ, &c.

Digitized by Google

small. 2. Prayer and daily address to the throne of grace for lesser sins of daily incursion, without which no man lives. For pardon of these, He has taught us to say, "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us." 3. For greater and more heinous sins, He has allowed us the expiation of a more solemn and particular repentance; and that either public (in case of scandalous, flagrant, and public crimes, which deserve excommunication from the body of Christ), or else private repentance between God and ourselves, for such crimes as do not bring us under the public discipline and censures of the Church. So that, beside baptism, we have a double method of obtaining pardon of sins, according to their different quality and greatness. Which pardon is confirmed and sealed to us in the holy communion, as it were, by a visible demonstration, which gives us, as by a deed of conveyance, the body and blood of Christ, and all the expiation and atonement that attends them. So that a sinner needs not complain of God for want of mercy, since there are so many ways of dispensing pardon to us after baptism.

But some, who are actually pardoned by God and in his favour, cannot think themselves so, because they find his hand in some measure still upon them: either, first, in temporal calamities, which are many times the natural effects of sin; or, secondly, in providential afflictions, which He, for wise reasons, and their own good, is pleased to lay and continue upon them; or, thirdly, because they are sometimes under fresh agonies upon the remembrance of their by-past sins; or, fourthly, because God's grace is not so powerful in them, as to cleanse them from all the relics of sinful frailty and corruption, and make them angels before their time; or, lastly, because they are still liable to temptations, and troubled with black and ugly thoughts, darted into their minds against their wills, by the power and subtlety of Satan. Now, to remove these scruples and complaints, I proceed to the second general thing proposed, which was,

2. To obviate and answer those difficulties, which often make penitent sinners think they want God's mercy, when

Digitized by Google

they really enjoy it. And to these I shall answer both in general and particular.

In general, I say, all this proceeds only from a wrong apprehension of the mercy of God, which does not oblige Him to remove all these several sorts of afflictions, or imperfections, from sinners at the moment that He pardons their sins. For Christ had no sin; He was innocence itself, that needed no pardon; and yet "He was a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief" all his life; nay, "He was subject to temptations also, as we are, yet without sin, that He might know how to succour them that are tempted." What wonder, then, that any mortal sinner should be subject to such calamities, as Christ himself, the immortal God, who knew no sin, was pleased to submit to, as well for our benefit as instruction?

But to answer a little more particularly and distinctly to the several scruples: I observed, in the first place, that temporal calamities were many times only the natural effects of sin. And why should any man wonder, that God should permit the natural effects of sin to remain upon the sinner after pardon, when in many cases it could not be otherwise without a special miracle? If a man, by a drunken or debauched life, brings upon himself a lingering fever or a consumption, God may pardon his sin upon his true repentance; but He is not obliged, either by any promise, or by the nature of his mercy, to work a special miracle in his case, to deliver him from his bodily distemper. Nay, perhaps, it is a mercy not to deliver him from it; since without a second miracle of preventing grace, perhaps the man, as soon as he was healed, would return to his old course again. It is rather mercy, therefore, to let the natural effects of his sins remain upon him, even after pardon.

2. So again, if God sends some providential afflictions upon men: they are not to interpret these always as acts of anger or judgment, but arguments of his kindness and mercy, designed by God only to prevent sin, and keep them humble. As it was in the case of St. Paul, who was a chosen vessel, and a particular favourite of Heaven; yet God

Digitized by Google

thought fit to afflict him with a thorn in the flesh, a messenger of Satan, sent to buffet him, to keep him humble, lest he should be exalted above measure, through the abundance of the revelations that were given him. For this he besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from him: but he only received this answer, that God's grace should be sufficient for him; that God's strength should be perfected in his weakness. With which answer he was satisfied, and made no further complaints, as if God was wanting to him in his mercy: but, "Most gladly, therefore," says he, "will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me. Therefore, I take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses, for Christ's sake: for when I am weak, then am I strong" (2 Cor. xii. 9, 10). The afflictions of Job were, in like manner, not expressions of God's anger, but his infinite wisdom and kindness to him; to approve his patience to all the world, and give him such a surprising victory over Satan, as made even the adversary himself imagine, there was something more in human nature, assisted by grace, than he before was apprehensive of. So that when God sends providential afflictions upon penitent sinners, they are not always scourges; but sometimes mercies, to try their patience, or to preserve them from sin. And if their prayers for removal of them are at last heard, as Job's was, they may rejoice and be thankful. If they are denied, as St. Paul's was, they may be patient still, and rejoice in their infirmities with the great apostle, that the power of Christ may rest upon them.

3. But some penitents are afraid their sins are not pardoned, because they are frequently under fears and apprehensions of God's anger and displeasure recurring upon them. Now, if this be for any new wilful sins committed after pardon, they have reason enough, indeed, to fear; because of that saying of our Saviour, "Thou art made whole; sin no more, lest a worse thing come unto thee." But if it be only for the remembrance of former sins, which are already pardoned, such fears are no indications of their being out of God's favour, but tokens of his mercy, who suffers

Digitized by Google

such fears to recur upon them, to make their repentance commensurate with their lives, and by the abhorrence of by-past sins, to keep them from future falling. That it is so, is evident from the case of David, who, after his sin, was pardoned by the mouth of the prophet: and he was infallibly assured of it, yet he lay under great agonies and conflicts of soul upon the remembrance of his great transgressions. Hear one or two of his expressions and complaints upon this occasion (Psalm xxxviii. 2): "Thy arrows stick fast in me, and thy hand presseth me sore. There is no soundness in my flesh, because of thine anger; neither is there any rest in my bones, by reason of my sin. For mine iniquities are gone over mine head; as a sore burden, they are too heavy for me. My wounds stink, and are corrupt, because of my foolishness. I am troubled; I am bowed down greatly; I go mourning all the day long. For my loins are filled with a loathsome disease; and there is no soundness in my flesh. I am feeble and sore broken: I have roared by reason of the disquietness of my heart." So again (Psalm lxxvii. 2): "My sore ran in the night, and ceased not: my soul refused to be comforted. I remembered God, and was troubled: I complained, and my spirit was overwhelmed. Thou holdest mine eyes waking: I am so troubled that I cannot speak. Will the Lord cast off for ever? and will he be no more entreated? Is his mercy clean gone for ever? and doth his promise fail for evermore? Hath God forgotten to be gracious? hath he in anger shut up his tender mercies?" At last, he recollects, and checks himself for these complaints: "I said, This is mine own infirmity: but I will remember the years of the right hand of the Most High." I will call to mind what God before has done for me; and then there will be no room nor reason for such complaints as these.

4. But some are afraid their sins are not pardoned, because they find in themselves still the remainders of sin; and grace is not so powerful in them, as to conquer all manner of sin whatsoever. Now, if this be meant of wilful, reigning, gross, habitual sins, they have reason indeed to fear: for then their repentance is not sincere, whilst they

Digitized by Google

knowingly cherish any one reigning vice in their souls; for "he that keepeth the whole law, and yet offendeth in one point, is guilty of all. He that said, 'Do not commit adultery,' said also, 'Do not kill:' now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law:" and so long thou art not in a state of grace and favour with God, because thou art a wilful trangressor of his law. But if it be meant only of lesser sins of ignorance, inadvertency, sudden surprise, and human frailty, to which all men are liable, against which they daily strive, but cannot wholly conquer; these are consistent with a state of grace and favour: because the very best of men are still liable to them. "In many things we offend all:" and, in this sense, there is "no man lives, and sinneth not." But God, in his mercy, hath provided a remedy for these, which is our daily prayers: "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us." If it were otherwise, our condition were very deplorable: for then no man could be saved; there being no man, except Christ alone, who ever lived without these. So that if God should be extreme to mark what is done amiss, no man could abide it. If He should strictly enter into judgment with us for these things, no man living could be justified in his sight: for this is only the perfection of angels, and the privilege of the spirits of just men made perfect. Whilst we are in this body of flesh, there will be those failings and imperfections in us. God has left them in us to exercise our care and vigilance, and to keep us humble and depending upon his grace; and to quicken our addresses to him for more and more strength to overcome them. Therefore we ought to watch and strive, indeed, against them as much as we can, and pray, "That his will may be done in earth, as it is done in heaven." But if, after all our prayers and endeavours, we cannot wholly free ourselves from them, we are not to despond, because we are only in the condition of all mankind. We ought also to grieve and sorrow for these imperfections, as well as all others, and to aspire after the place that will set us at liberty from them: but we must not expect to be angels before our time; but, whilst we are

Digitized by Google

in this vale of misery, be content to bear these as part of our afflictions which nothing but death, or rather a victory over death and mortality, will wholly conquer. In the meantime, we have assurance, that God will not impute them to us to our condemnation, but pity us, and pardon us upon our constant prayers and daily repentance. And in this sense it is, that St. Austin calls these 'venial sins:'[c] not because any sin is not mortal in its own nature, but because they are such as God will not impute to his servants, who sincerely love him, to their condemnation.

5. But some penitents are afraid their sins are not pardoned, because they are still liable to temptations, and troubled with black and ugly thoughts, darted into their minds, against their wills, by the power and subtlety of Satan. Now, in this case, two things are always diligently to be inquired into. 1. Whether temptations are of men's own procuring, either by idleness and want of some honest employment, or by putting themselves in the way of temptation, by engaging in any unlawful business or diversion? And, 2. Whether a man cherishes the temptation, or gives way and consent to it? If either of these be his case, he is guilty of sin. For he that by idleness, or negligence, or any unlawful employment, puts himself in the way of temptation, tempts the tempter, as it were, to tempt him. Tertullian tells us of a certain Christian in his time,[d] who went to the Roman theatre, or stage-plays, and returned possessed with a devil: and the unclean spirit being asked by the exorcist, How he durst presume to attack a Christian; answered confidently, That he had a right to do it, because he found the party upon his ground. So that if men are engaged in any unlawful business, and a temptation then befals them; the very temptation itself is their crime, because they make themselves beforehand parties and accessaries to it. Or if it befal them without their sin, yet if afterwards they give way, and consent, and yield to the force of it, they make it their crime by their sinful com-

[c] Aug. de Symbolo, lib. i. c. vii. Non vobis dico, quia sine peccato hic vivetis: sed sunt venialia, sine quibus vita ista non est.

[d] Tertul. de Spectaculis, (c. xxvi. Paris, 1664, p. 83.) In meo eam inveni.

Digitized by Google

pliance with it. But setting aside these two cases, it is no crime to be tempted, whilst we are merely passive in the temptation. Of which we have this infallible proof and demonstration, that Christ himself was tempted of the devil, yet without sin in any but the tempter. And so long as we keep ourselves pure after the same example; that we neither be accessary in calling the temptation on ourselves, nor by any slavish cowardice, in the spirit of bondage, yield a base compliance to it; but as soon as we find it, reject it with indignation and abhorrence, as our Saviour did, "Get thee behind me, Satan, for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." So long, I say, as it makes no further impression on us, but to raise our anger, or zeal, or resolution against it; while we do not receive it with pleasure, nor give any consent, or access, or encouragement, to it, so far we are secure: it is the devil's crime, not ours: it may be our affliction, but it is not our sin. It may raise in us horror and astonishment, as any sudden surprise is apt to do; and it may, perhaps, create us anguish and trouble, to think how we are exposed to the assaults of Satan, who has power to work upon our imaginations, and thereby disturb our fancies, and raise unaccountable thoughts in us: but so long as our wills, over which he has no power, yield no consent, the most fiery of all his darts, the most subtle of all his devices, cannot hurt us. Whilst we resist the devil, he must at last fly from us, and yield the victory: and then we may rejoice in the conquest, though, perhaps, we could not in the very engagement. "For no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless afterward, it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness to them that are exercised thereby" (Heb. xii. 11). In which respect one apostle bids us, "Count it all joy when we fall into divers temptations; knowing this, that the trial of your faith worketh patience. Only let patience have her perfect work" (James, i. 2), and then it will be joy in the end, when we have baffled the adversary, and gained the victory. And, says another apostle, "We glory in tribulations also: knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, expe-

Digitized by Google

rience; and experience, hope; and hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, that is given unto us" (Rom. v. 3). We do but love God the more in such cases; the more we are tempted by Satan to desert or forsake Him, it quickens our zeal, redoubles our care and watch, invigorates our faith, and inflames our devotion, to make us fly with greater frequency, and greater ardency, to the throne of grace, to find help in time of need. So the very temptations of Satan turn to our advantage, whilst we resist and repel them; and we are more than conquerors over him, because we invert his wicked designs, and turn those things to our health and strength, which he designed should be an occasion of falling. Therefore, we have reason to suppose in such cases, that God permits Satan to tempt us only for our advantage: and it is not only a demonstration of his own wisdom and power, so to countermine the wiles of Satan, and draw good out of evil; but also an argument of his mercy to us, to make our graces more illustrious, and our victory more glorious; whilst He perfects his strength in our weakness, and makes us triumph over all the power of the enemy and the very gates of hell, which cannot prevail against us.

I suppose, now it appears plainly to every one, that these things are no impeachments of God's mercy: though He first suffers temporal calamities, and death among these, as the natural effects of sin, to befal the penitent sinners after pardon; though He sometimes, secondly, sends providential afflictions on them; though, thirdly, He visits them sometimes with fears and trembling upon the remembrance of their by-past sins; though, fourthly, He leaves them still under the remains and strugglings of human infirmity, and lesser failings and corruptions; though, fifthly, He permits them to be liable to temptations, and to be troubled with black and ugly thoughts, darted into their minds against their wills, by the power and subtlety of Satan; yet for all this, he is a merciful father to them: and "as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him."

I cannot close this discourse without making these few

Digitized by Google

moral reflections on it, by way of inference from what has been said.

1. That the sense of God's mercy in pardoning the greatest of sinners, should encouaage all others to return to Him, in the sincerity of their hearts, with hopes of mercy. There can be no sin greater than that of murdering Christ; and yet God was pleased to pardon it, for the encouragement of others, who should repent in future ages. There can be no service less than that of the widow's two mites; and yet God was pleased to accept it, because it proceeded from a willing mind, and was answerable to the ability which God had given her, who never requires of any man more than He first enables him to perform.

2. The consideration of God's leaving sometimes temporal afflictions upon men after He pardons their sin, should teach us to entertain right and honourable thoughts of God's mercy, not to repine at his hand or dealings with us in any other respect, if He grants us the remission of our sins; but to be patient and content under any other afflictions, when we are assured they are not arguments of his wrath, but rather indications of his goodness and mercy, who knows what is most convenient for us: as Moses told the Israelites, "Thou shalt remember, that as a father chasteneth his son, so the Lord thy God chasteneth thee."

3. The sense of God's mercy in pardoning our sins, should raise in us the highest affections of love and gratitude to Him again. For what a ravishment is it for a desponding, poor, afflicted soul to be delivered from the fears of hell, and to hear Christ say, as it were, "To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise!" What thanks can any man render to God for such a blessing, less than the obedience of his whole life? What zeal can be too great in serving such a master? If we offer our bodies and souls a living sacrifice to God, and serve and glorify Him in both continually, it is but a reasonable service to Him, who hath redeemed both from hell. Let all those, therefore, who have the sense of God's favour in the pardon of their sins, be as sensible of their own obligations to glorify Him both in body and soul continually, that they may shew forth the praises

Digitized by Google

of Him, "who hath called them out of darkness into his marvellous light."

4. Lastly, the consideration of God's mercy and pity to us, should teach us, in every instance of it, to imitate his blessed example; to put on bowels of mercy, to be kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven us: to pity those, who know not their own misery, nor have any power or will to help themselves: to have compassion on the ignorant, and them that are out of the way: to bear with their infirmities, and even their prejudices, and dulness, and obstinacy, as God many times does with ours; meekly instructing those who oppose themselves, if God, peradventure, may give them repentance, to the acknowledgment of the truth. Here every man is allowed to have his share in the Christian priesthood, to call, and convert, and save as many as he can, by his private instructions and public example; that he may in this way also shew forth the praises of Him "that hath called him out of darkness into his marvellous light." None are better qualified for this office, than they who have signally experimented God's mercy themselves. They must needs be the best monitors to others, who have felt the misery and slavery of sin in their own hearts, and know the happiness of pardon and deliverance in their own persons. It was, therefore, our Saviour's admonition to St. Peter, upon the view of his falling and rising again, "When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." And there are infinite reasons to engage penitent converts to this. First, compassion to human nature, to relieve men from that thraldom, which they themselves were once engaged in. Then, again, gratitude to God, to promote his glory; which is chiefly done by the conversion of sinners, whilst our light so shines before men, that they may see our good works, and glorify our Father which is in heaven. Which is a zeal that ought to be in every true convert, and commonly is in those who have been themselves great and eminent sinners. For they to whom God forgives much, commonly love Him the more, and labour more abundantly in his service, as St. Paul did, in consideration that he had obtained mercy of

Digitized by Google

God, who had been once the greatest of sinners. Add to this, the honour of the office and employment, than which nothing can be more glorious: for it makes us workers together with God, and a sort of under-saviours to mankind. "For," says St. James, "brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him; let him know, that he which converteth a sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins." Finally, it is most beneficial and advantageous to ourselves, as it gives us a title to a greater degree of glory in another world. For they that be teachers, "shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and ever." It is impossible to give greater encouragement: God grant us his grace to obtain it, through Jesus Christ our Lord;

To whom, with the Father, and the Holy Spirit, be ascribed, as is most due, all honour, might, majesty, and dominion, both now, and for evermore. Amen.

END OF THE EIGHTH VOLUME.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY MOYES AND BARCLAY, CASTLE STREET, LEICESTER SQUARE.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google